DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 014 HE 023 180

AUTHOR Altbach, Philip G.

TITLE Perspectives on Comparative Higher Education: Essays on Faculty, Students and Reform. Special Studies in Comparative Education No. 22.

INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. Comparative Education Center.

REPORT NO ISBN-0-937033-12-X
PUB DATE Oct 89
NOTE 79p.
AVAILABLE FROM Comparative Education Center. 428 Christopher Baldy Hall, SUNY-Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *College Faculty; *Comparative Education; Developed Nations; *Developing Nations; *Educational Change; *Educational Trends; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Political Attitudes; *Professors; Sociocultural Patterns; Student Attitudes; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Three essays by the Director of the Comparative Education Center at the State University of New York (Buffalo) have the following titles: "Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession," "Student Political Activism," and "University Reform". The first essay discusses the role of the academic profession in the university, stressing the professoriate is the most important single element in the university. Topics considered are autonomy, accountability and the professoriate; the professoriate under stress; historical perspectives; the sociology of the professoriate; promotion and remuneration; national case studies; and the professoriate as an international community. The second essay offers some general perspectives on student politics including the historical context, the impossibility of a "permanent revolution" in the university, responses to activism, who the activists are, the impact of activism, and differences in student activism in the industrial nations and the Third World. The final essay looks at the sources and nature of reform in the university in a discussion of difficulties of reform, the need for reform, the impetus for reform, the process of reform, trends in the 1960s, the 1970s and beyond, and future directions. References follow each paper. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315014

Perspectives on Comparative Higher Education: Essays on Faculty, Students and Reform

---

Philip G. Altbach

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philip G. Altbach
Comparative Educ. Center, SUNY, Buffalo
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Special Studies in Comparative Education

Number Twenty-Two

COMPARATIVE
EDUCATION CENTER
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

HE 023180

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERSPECTIVES ON COMPARATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION:
Essays on Faculty, Students and Reform

Philip G. Altbach

Special Studies in Comparative Education
Number Twenty-Two

Comparative Education Center
Graduate School of Education
State University of New York at Buffalo

First printing, October, 1989

Copyright c 1989
Comparative Education Center
State University of New York at Buffalo

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the Comparative Education Center.
Enquiries may be addressed to the Center at 428 Christopher Baldy Hall, SUNY-Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260, USA

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Altbach, Philip G.
Perspectives on comparative higher education : essays on faculty, students, and reform / Philip G. Altbach.
p. cm. -- (Special studies in comparative education ; no. 22)
Written for the International encyclopedia of comparative higher education.
ISBN 0-937033-12-X : $6.00
1. Education, Higher. 2. Universities and colleges--Faculty. 3. College students--Political activity. 4. Comparative education. I. Title. II. Series.
LB2322.A43 1989
378--dc20 89-29271
CIP

Contents

Introduction iv
Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession 1
Student Political Activism 33
University Reform 53

Introduction

This publication, the Twenty-second in the Special Studies series of the Comparative Education Center, reflects current work relating to postsecondary education by the Center's director, Philip G. Altbach. Higher Education has been one of the major foci of the work of the Center for more than a decade. These three essays reflect some of the continuing themes of Philip Altbach's research -- a broad concern with understanding how students and faculty related to the challenges to higher education, the integration of Third World perspectives into research on postsecondary education and a concern for change in higher education institutions. All three essays are explicitly comparative.

These essays were written for the International Encyclopedia of Comparative Higher Education, which Philip Altbach is editing for Garland Publishing Co. The Encyclopedia will be published at the end of 1990. "Student Political Activism" also appeared in Comparative Education 25 (1989), pp. 97-110.

The Comparative Education Center is a multidisciplinary research and service center of the Graduate School of Education, State University of New York at Buffalo. Among the current research interests at the Center are women and education (Professor Gail Kelly), examinations in comparative perspective (Professor Harold Noah) and scientific development and higher education (Professor Philip Altbach). The Center currently houses the Secretariat of the Comparative and International Education Society and serves as the home for the Pergamon Press series on comparative education. It is associated with SUNY's graduate academic program in comparative education. This publication series reflects the research work of academic staff and students concerned with comparative education at SUNY-Buffalo. Further information concerning these publications and the Center's other activities can be obtained from the Center.

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES ON THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

Philip G. Altbach

The academic profession is at the heart of the university. Without a well qualified, committed and adequately compensated professoriate, no academic institution can be fully successful. The professors teach, do research and through their activities define the university. Their work is, in essence, the university. Everything else -- administrative structures, laboratories, libraries -- exists to assist the academic profession in the basic tasks of teaching and research. Universities are highly complex institutions that have multiple roles in society and, in the contemporary context, the central role of the professoriate is sometimes forgotten. This essay seeks to discuss the role of the academic profession in the university and to focus on some key characteristics of the profession in a period of considerable turmoil. At the center of this consideration is a the conviction that the professoriate is the most important single element in the university.[1]

The defining characteristic of the academic profession is the teaching function. From the beginning, professors have taught. Research, and a myriad of other roles, have come later. As universities have become more complex and multifaceted, the central role of teaching is sometimes less clear. Teaching, of course, takes place in different contexts and settings. Traditional lectures are supplemented by seminar discussions and tutorials. Teaching includes advising an advanced student about a dissertation or working with postdoctoral fellows in a laboratory. Teaching also takes place through publication of journal articles and books. Teaching, thus, occurs not only in the classroom but also is a role that extends well beyond the traditional context. Knowledge dissemination in all of its different formats is part of the teaching process and is central to the role of the academic profession.

During the past century, since the growth of research as a key university function, first in Germany and then in the United States and elsewhere, the role of the professoriate has expanded dramatically in function and the profession has become much more important.[2] As Harold Perkin has written, the professoriate has become a "key profession" in almost every society.[3] Professors not only provide instruction in the traditional academic fields, beginning in the medieval universities with medicine, law and theology but now in a wide variety of subjects including many which have much significance to contemporary society.[4] The role of the professor as "expert" has greatly expanded and members of the academic profession are called on frequently to provide expertise to government and industry. Professors also play political roles in some countries. Faculty members serve as members of parliament, ministers in the government and occasionally as oppositional leaders. Less directly, professors are sometimes involved in university-based politics. Some are actively engaged in journalistic and other writing which has a political impact. In the context of larger universities and with growing research responsibilities, professors have become managers of research, sometimes controlling significant budgets. In sum, the role and scope of the academic profession has expanded significantly. Academics are no longer confined to an Ivory Tower. They are based in universities but many play much wider roles in society. This situation makes the definition of the academic role difficult.

There are also significant national variations in the professoriate. Roles and functions differ from country to country and while there are many common elements, there are also important national differences as well.[5] The historical evolution of the profession has varied and contemporary realities differ. National circumstances have shaped academic systems and along with them the academic profession. In some countries, academic freedom is well established and there are few constraints on professoriate research or writings. In others, many restrictions apply. There are significant variations in remuneration, in academic support facilities, in teaching and research responsibilities, in the arrangement of the academic career and in other areas. In situations of considerable variation, definition becomes difficult.

A few examples will illustrate some variations in the academic profession. In Latin America, until quite recently, academics had no role in research, academic salaries were quite low and the academic profession was seen as a part-time responsibility, supplemented by other jobs.[6] The "taxi-cab" professor was the norm, running from a campus lecture to a legal case or job in private industry. In such circumstances, it is not surprising that a well-defined sense of professionalism did not develop. As Latin American nations have moved to upgrade their universities, they have had to ensure that the professorial role became full-time and that the profession developed a commitment to the university.

In sharp contrast, the British professoriate has traditionally been considered a full-time responsibility and the norms of the profession are well established. While the salaries of British academics are not at the top of the world scales and there has been significant deterioration in recent years, it has always been assumed that the professoriate would have a middle-class life style. British academics have been assured of a considerable amount of academic freedom and security of tenure as well. The British academic profession is an example of a well established university system which has a recognized role in society and about which there has been a broad social consensus. Many of the world's academics work in countries which have been under colonial domination. In many of these countries the academic profession developed in a "culture of subservience" without either strong links to indigenous social institutions or with of the protections of the established Western universities.[7] In many formerly colonial areas, academic freedom was not well protected and academics did not have security of tenure. The curriculum was imposed from the outside as was the language of instruction. The heritage of the colonial system continues to play a role in the independent nations of the Third World.

The examples give an indication of the different academic cultures that exist in the contemporary world. In countries where research is not an important responsibility in the universities, the working conditions, responsibilities and role of the professoriate will often differ significantly from academic systems which stress research and where the universities (and the professors) are linked directly to economic development and technological progress. The level of economic development of a country also has an impact on the universities and on the academic profession. Wealthier countries can afford better equipped university systems and can afford to support the professoriate as well. There are a few examples (such as Malawi) where relatively poor nations have fairly well supported universities. Political realities also help to determine the situation of the academic profession. Authoritarian regimes generally restrict the academic freedom of the professoriate and sometimes place severe restrictions on the functioning of the universities, including on occasion the jailing of academics or the closing of entire universities. It is clear from this discussion that a variety of factors help to determine the roles and functions of the professoriate in a given time and place.

Autonomy, Accountability and the Professoriate

Academics are professionals in the traditional sense of the term but they also work in the bureaucratic environment of the university. In this sense, they are unlike the traditional liberal professions such as law and medicine, in which practitioners have control over the work environment. The academic profession depends on salaries from the universities (in many instances ultimately from the government) and in many countries, professors are civil servants. This combination of professional status, on the one hand, and bureaucratic constraints on the other is somewhat unique.[8] The academic profession sees itself as a traditional profession and demands the perquisites of a profession. Most societies rank the professoriate highly and accord it professional status. The academic profession traditionally values its autonomy and its ability to set not only its own goals but also to determine the curriculum, requirements for awarding degrees and the ethos and orientation of the university. The concept of autonomy is generally linked both to the individual professor and also to the governance of the university.[9]

Professorial and institutional autonomy is increasingly challenged by accountability -- the demand that universities be answerable to external authority for the expenditure of funds and ultimately for their activities and products.[10] The conflict between autonomy and accountability is an example of the tension between the university as a bureaucratic institution on the one hand and as a institutional home for autonomous professionals on the other. This tension has existed since the establishment of universities in the medieval period and the history of higher education is filled with examples of conflicts. In the early history of universities, academic institutions, especially in Italy which were controlled by students, moved frequently from town to town in order to preserve their autonomy and to gain other advantages.11 The academic profession has repeatedly struggled to maintain its autonomy--in terms of academic freedom, the ability to govern the institution and determine who should be admitted and who should graduate, and to control the curriculum. The professors have not won all of the battles by any means and the tension continues to exist.

Over the centuries,the challenges to professorial autonomy have come from many sources. In the early period, ecclesiastical authorities sought, often successfully, to ensure that professors and academic institutions were loyal to established doctrine. At times, professors were involved in finding solutions to problems in the Catholic Church. At other times, Church authorities intervened in the affairs of universities to ensure doctrinal loyalty. Problems became especially serious at the time of the Protestant Reformation, when the academic profession was often caught in the doctrinal struggles of the period.[12] During this period, the concept of autonomy was often violated when external authorities were convinced that the universities had an important role in society and in the acrimonious debates of the time.

In a sense, when universities have been least central and important, their autonomy has been safest. Institutions that are purely "Ivory Towers" are of little relevance to the society and external authorities are often content to leave them alone. When academic institutions and the professoriate are at the center of societal development and when the universities require significant societal resources, many forces seek to challenge traditional autonomy.

The Modern University and the Professoriate

The contemporary period has been one of unprecedented accomplishment and significant challenge for the academic profession. The development of universities since the middle of the Nineteenth Century has dramatically changed the professoriate. The university has emerged in this period not only into a major societal institution, commanding significant resources, but also as a complex bureaucracy.[13] Research has been added as a key function of many universities. Universities have also added a dimension of direct service to their societies through consulting and advice.[14] These new roles have created new opportunities for the professoriate, have significantly enhanced the prestige and power of the academic profession and, perhaps most important, have moved the professoriate to a position of great importance in contemporary society. The academic profession no longer is simply providing instruction to a small elite but is educating and credentialing virtually the entire skilled sector of the society. The research done in the universities plays a direct and immediate role in the development of technology and industry.

As universities have grown, they have become more bureaucratic and complex. The direct power of the professors over the structures of governance has been limited by a new layer of professional bureaucrats who have significant power over the day-to-day operation of the university. The traditional oligarchy of the senior academic staff has, in many institutions, been replaced by committee structures. As universities have expanded -- some campuses have grown to contain more than 50,000 students and 3,000 academic staff -- traditional structures of governance have been replaced by more bureaucratic arrangements which have limited the direct control of the professoriate.[15]

The modern university has provided the context for the professoriate to expand to an unprecedented extent, not only in size but also in its role and influence in society. It has contributed to the increased prestige of the academic profession and to its centrality in the economic and technological structures of contemporary societies. At the same time, the modern university has presented many challenges to the profession.[16]

The Professoriate under Stress

As the professoriate approaches the 21st century, it faces both serious challenges and new opportunities. Its problems--and they are significant--do not challenge this reality. Some of the problems stem from the very success of the profession in the post World War Two period. The hallmark of the post-war period has been growth and expansion, and this has had significant implications for the academic profession.

Some have argued that as the academic profession has expanded from a small elite and fairly homogeneous community in most countries, it has lost its focus and ethos. Conservative critics like Robert Nisbet have claimed that the professoriate has forgotten its commitment to the basic ideals of the university --teaching and research in the core academic fields.[17] Expansion has certainly expanded the function of the university, has split the academic profession into many disciplines and subfields and has made the "community of scholars" more of a dream than a reality. Academics at the top of their fields, the cosmopolitans, look more to their disciplines than to their universities, and they have less of a commitment to the local academic community.[18]

The dramatic and unprecedented expansion of the 1950s and 1960s in many countries not only dislocated the academic community in the process of coping with expansion but also made it more difficult to cope with the period of modest retrenchment that followed in many industrialized nations. The expansion of the 1960s had a number of unanticipated consequences. It created a large group of academics who, in the next two decades, prevented a succeeding generation of scholars from gaining access to academic jobs. This same generation will soon retire in large numbers, creating shortages in some fields. In most industrialized nations, enrollments dropped as the generational cohorts became smaller and the proportion of age group going on to university stopped increasing. Martin Trow, who argued in the 1960s that the world's academic systems were moving inevitably from an elite to mass and then to universal access was proved at least partially wrong as most European academic systems stopped growing once they reached the threshold of a mass system.[19] Only the United States, with Canada and to some extent Japan following, has reached the level of universal access and even in the U. S. expansion has stopped.

Expansion meant that ever larger budgets were required for postsecondary education. When economies were growing and there was faith that universities were worthwhile investments, governments were willing to provide the needed funds. An economic downturn in the the early 1970s was accompanied by a loss of faith in higher education, in part stimulated by a reaction to student protest movements. This meant not only that academic budgets stopped expanding but also that governments demanded more accountability for the expenditure of funds. These developments impinged directly on the academic profession. Salary increases did not keep up with rates of inflation and the academic profession, for the first time in several decades, saw its levels of remuneration actually decline in "real terms".

For much of the period of the 1970s and 1980s, the academic profession, at least in the industrialized nations, has been under considerable pressure and strain and morale has sagged.[20] The nature of these pressures can be quickly noted:

*Funds for research virtually disappeared in many humanities and social science fields and have declined in most scientific areas;

*As new positions in universities have slowed or disappeared, job mobility at the senior levels diminished significantly. Faculty members who at one time were able to move to another institution to escape a difficult situation found these options no longer available;

*Few openings for younger scholars meant that little "new blood" was entering the profession. Another result was the decline of enrollments in graduate departments as students discovered that there were few academic openings and stopped pursuing doctoral study in many fields;

*Financial strains on the knowledge dissemination system meant that there were fewer opportunities to publish books and more competition for space in the top journals in virtually fields at the same time that standards for promotion within institutions became tighter, with greater stress on publication as a criterion for promotion;

*Accountability has required academics to submit to more fiscal controls and in some instances there have been demands by external authorities for academics to change specialties or to increase their "productivity."

*The traditional "tenure" system has come under significant strain and it has in some cases been compromised. In the United States, fiscal constraints during the 1970s meant that some universities and colleges fired "tenured" senior member of the professoriate. In Britain and Australia and in a few other countries (including the United States) academics were offered incentives to retire early. The "golden handshake" became a part of academic parlance.[21] Debates concerning the usefulness of providing lifetime employment for academic staff have taken place in several countries although only in Britain has a decision been made to abolish the traditional tenure system for academics.[22]

*In most industrialized nations, the morale and commitment of the academic profession has significantly declined. More than in the previous decades, the professoriate has felt economic strain, loss of esteem from the society, and a decline of funding. They seem to feel less secure and less self-confident.

*There has been remarkably little violation of academic freedom during this period of difficulty. By and large, government authorities have remained committed to academic freedom for the professoriate even while placing fiscal and other restrictions on institutions of higher learning.

It seems that the academic climate has again changed in many industrialized countries in the late 1980s and is more favorable than in the previous two decades although the period of dramatic growth of the 1960s has not been restored. The exception to this general upturn is Britain, where the Thatcher Government continues to squeeze the universities financially. The British government, in general, has become highly committed to accountability in higher education. For example, the traditional means of funding the British universities, the University Grants Committee, has been replaced by a funding council that will be directly under the control of the Ministry of Education and Science.[23] In general, however, a number of factors have contributed to a renewed prosperity in higher education. A modest upturn in enrollments, stimulated largely by demographic factors, is taking place. Retirements of senior staff are beginning and will accelerate in the coming period, causing considerable opening in the academic profession while at the same time creating some problems of staffing. The universities have regained much of the prestige they lost during the crises of the 1960s and research funds have again begun to flow.

It is worth noting that the problems and challenges facing the profession are similar in most of the industrialized nations of the West. In some, such as France, the crisis of the past decade was not very serious. In a few others, such as Spain, a late start on expansion has placed its academic system in a somewhat earlier phase of development. Sweden went through a particularly traumatic period in the aftermath of the massive U-68 reform effort at the end of the 1960s, with damaging implications for the academic profession.[24] The Canadian academic profession still faces problems of retrenchment and cutbacks but without major dislocation. Thus, while the specific national responses vary from country to country, the broader issues are similar.

The situation in the developing countries of the Third World shows a marked variation from the pattern in the industrialized nations, although there are also many national differences as well. The basic fact is that the mode of decline so evident in the industrialized nations did not take place, by and large, in the Third World.[25] Colleges and universities continued to expand, at varying rates, throughout the period. In some countries, research slowly emerged as a focus of higher education, and resources were added to assist the research sector. Because autonomy and in some cases academic freedom, was limited in academic systems which have a colonial tradition, there has been a struggle to establish these norms and success has by no means been universal. By and large, however, the pessimistic tone that marked the higher education systems of the industrialized nations did not characterize the Third World, where the academic profession is still engaged in establishing itself.

The challenges to the academic profession in the Third World are also considerable. The struggle to build a sense of autonomy and of professionalism in colleges and universities is a difficult one. Government authorities fear universities and academics, worrying that subversive ideas will be spread in countries which sometimes have only limited stability. The infrastructures of fully established universities must still be built up, including sometimes not only the buildings, libraries and laboratories but also the structures of academic governance and academic freedom. These tasks must be accomplished in societies which do not have traditions of Western style higher education. The tasks are considerable, not only in financial and infrastructural terms, but also intellectually and politically. Yet, there seems to be considerable enthusiasm for the establishment of an academic profession that reflects the norms and values of the academic tradition built in the West.

The post-war period has not been an easy one for the academic profession and the past two decades have been particularly stressful. In the industrialized nations, the trauma of growth was replaced by the stress of decline. Now, in the last decade of the century, retrenchment no longer seems to be looming over the profession. Yet, challenges remain. In the Third World, there remains the task of building a fully modern academic profession combining the norms of the international academic community while at the same time meeting national needs and functioning in still traditional societies.

Historical Perspectives

As with other professional groups, historical traditions play a key role in the consciousness of the academic profession. The history of the academic profession not only tells us a great deal about how the profession developed over time, but also about the contemporary professoriate. Over time, there are some common elements in the historical development of the profession. The professoriate, in every period and circumstance, has attempted to secure for itself as much autonomy as possible. The professoriate has also tried to maximize its academic freedom, although definitions of academic freedom have varied over time. The professoriate has often felt it more important to protect freedom of teaching and research within the academic institution than its ability to speak out on non-academic matters outside of the university, although both have been valued.[26] Not surprisingly, the academic profession has sought to maximize its income and prestige.

It is possible to see in the medieval University of Paris, the basic institutional model for the modern university, many of the trends still evident in the contemporary academic profession. The opposing medieval institutional tradition, the student dominated University of Bologna, did not emerge as the dominant institutional model;[27] it was the professor-dominated Paris model that was most influential. The Paris professors attempted to enshrine autonomy as the guiding principle of the university. Their conviction was that the university should be fully controlled by the professors. The faculty should determine the curriculum, the process of admitting students, the requirements for degrees and the appropriate standards for awarding those degrees, and the internal governance of the institution. The professors should also control the financial and other resources of the university. Professorial control over the appointment and promotion of staff was also considered to be central to autonomy, since this permitted the academic profession to perpetuate itself and to ensure appropriate standards for incumbents. This concept of professorial control has remained a keystone of academic dogma ever since.

The Paris faculty had significant difficulty in establishing their control. Neither the Roman Catholic Church nor the French monarchy were willing for the University of Paris to gain full autonomy. Both feared that the university might cause problems and each wished to use the university for its own purposes. Church and State recognized that the university was a key institution and that the professors were of special importance because they controlled knowledge and access to information as well as credentialing for increasingly crucial positions in society. Both tried to intervene in academic matters and the success of the University was not complete. Nonetheless, the University of Paris faculty were able to establish over time a tradition of considerable autonomy, especially in the areas they felt most central--the curricùlum, admissions, recruitment to the profession and awarding of degrees.[28]

The role of the University of Paris and of its faculty grew to be central to society. The University became responsible for training the key professions of the day -- the clergy, lawyers and medical doctors. The University also became the repository of much of the secular and some of the ecclesiastical knowledge of the day. University libraries, in the period before the printing press, were valuable repositories of knowledge. The University of Paris also participated in societal affairs, providing advice and expertise to both Church and State. Perhaps the most important contribution of the University of Paris was the key role it played in settling the longstanding and volatile dispute about the division of the Papacy between Avignon in France and the traditional Papal See in Rome. The fact that religious and secular authorities turned over to the professors in Paris the settlement of one of the most perplexing political and doctrinal issues of the day was highly significant.[29]

The academics of the University of Paris were able to develop their academic tradition in several ways. Perhaps the most important was their monopoly of expertise in areas needed by the society. The professors controlled entry to several key professions and they also controlled knowledge in these areas. They were also able to threaten to move the university away from troublesome political problems--the academic community was mobile and the physical facilities of the institution modest. The professors also controlled the bulk of the budget of the university, collecting money directly from the students and keeping costs relatively low. The university was kept small in terms both of the teaching staff and of student enrollments. Through these and other devices, the Paris faculty was able to build up a significant degree of autonomy in a context where there was relatively little societal autonomy. The professoriate was not, of course, completely free. In theology especially, teaching and expression was constrained by Church doctrine. Later, even in emerging scientific fields, there were Church-imposed limitations on teaching and research. Based mainly on the University of Paris model, universities grew throughout Europe. Only in Italy and to a lesser extent in Spain did the student-dominated model of the university persist.

It would be a mistake to assume that the growth and development of the academic profession from the University of Paris until the present time was one of uninterrupted progress. Far from it. For a period of several centuries in Europe, universities languished and the academic profession lost much of its dynamism. The responsibility for this moribund period lies significantly with the academic profession itself. During much of the 18th century and into the 19th century until the rise of the research-oriented German university at mid-century, the academic profession was not in the mainstream of society and did not contribute much to the rapid social and scientific development taking place at the time.[30] The professors seemed content to provide instruction in their traditional fields of expertise at a time when theology was less important to society and when science was rapidly developing. The universities became elite backwaters. The academic profession was recruited from traditional elite families and there was little motivation for intellectual expansion. Enrollments did not expand rapidly during this period.

This was a period of tremendous intellectual ferment and development in Europe in which the universities and the academic profession played only a minor part. The growth of nationalist ideas helped to create nationalist movements led to the unification of Italy and Germany. The academic profession played little role in this intellectual ferment although student organizations participated actively in several countries. One of the few exceptions to this rule was the movements of 1848, when both professors and students were very active (especially in the Austro-Hungarian Empire) in the political movements that emerged.[31] The scientific discoveries that led to the industrial revolution were also taking place at this time. Professors played only a peripheral role in these discoveries and inventions; most of this extraordinarily active period of scientific discovery took place outside of the universities, often independently and sometimes under the auspices of the scientific academies that grew throughout Europe.

Oxford and Cambridge were intellectual backwaters during this entire period. They only took an active interest in science and in research after they were reformed in the late 19th century--reforms that were were accomplished only after considerable debate and much opposition from the professors.[32] In the United Kingdom, universities in Scotland and some of the newer institutions in England such as Manchester participated in the Britain's key scientific and industrial development. In France, the universities were sufficiently peripheral that they were abolished entirely after the French Revolution and restored, and considerably reformed, several decades later![33] In the United States, where the Oxbridge collegiate model was imported, the emerging American colleges did not significantly participate in the scientific growth of the nation. Inventors like Benjamin Franklin (although he founded the University of Pennsylvania with a "practical" orientation) and Eli Whitney worked outside of an academic context.[34] Curiously, The Russian universities (with the exception of Moscow University) were established with a practical orientation and employed a large number of expatriate professors.[35]

The emergence of the modern university in the middle of the 19th century was a crucial turning point for the academic profession. In fact, the contemporary academic profession was as much shaped by this set of developments as it was by the medieval academic tradition. The transformation of the 19th century reshaped the university and the academic profession as well.[36] It is not possible here to discuss the full context of the academic revolution. The following elements were of primary importance:

*Research as a key university function. Developed first in Germany by Wilhelm von Humboldt as he reformed the German university , research was established as a primary responsibility of the professoriate. The academic profession was reorganized to permit research and funds were provided for research. Most important perhaps, the role of the professor was expanded from a transmitter of knowledge to one of a creator of knowledge.[37] Von Humboldt's idea was not only that research should be part of the academic vocation, but that this research should be relevant to the needs of a rapidly developing society. Thus, universities were engaged in both basic and applied research. The research idea spread quickly to the United States and a bit later to Japan, both societies seeking to develop rapidly at this time.

*The emergence of the academic disciplines and the professorial chair system reshaped the organization of the academic community. The German academic profession expanded the frontiers of knowledge through research, particularly in the sciences and newly emerging social sciences. A concomitant of this growth was a new style of academic organization, the chair system, which created a hierarchy of academic staff headed by a professor related to each academic discipline. The chair system helped the growth and sophistication of the new disciplines, but it also introduced considerable rigidity into the academic system. While Japan and much of Eastern Europe adopted the German-style chair system, Western European nations modified it to allow for less rigidity. In the United States, the academic department was created, which allowed for considerably more participation for junior academic ranks.[38] The nature of professorial organization was significantly altered and the patterns that were put into place have persisted, with some alterations, to the present.

*The concept of academic freedom was clarified, first in the German universities and later in other academic systems. The German idea of academic freedom stressed the freedom of the professor to teach his or her subject in classroom and to conduct and report on research without any restrictions. It did not extend to professorial utterances or writings on other subjects. The German concept focused on the freedom of the professor to deal with academic matters. In the United States, stimulated by the American Association of University Professors, academic freedom was extended to protect professorial speech and writing outside the area of academic expertise.[39]

*The terms and conditions of academic employment were clarified and the notion of "tenure" or presumed permanent employment became a standard part of professorial employment. In some countries, such as Germany, academic staff were direct appointees of the state and had the protections of senior civil servants with the addition of the protections of academic freedom. Academic ranks were established and a system of evaluation and promotion of junior staff was codified in many countries. While the American six-year probationary system is perhaps the most rigorous, other academic systems developed similar arrangements.

*The professorial role expanded significantly. Not only was research added as a primary function of the academic profession but the profession began to serve non-university constituencies with advice and expertise. "Public service" was added to the responsibilities of the academic profession.[40] This notion was most highly developed in the United States at the emerging public universities, and especially at the University of Wisconsin. It was also a part of the new German professorial arrangements but in a more limited way. Public service responsibilities took the professoriate further away from the traditional "Ivory Towers" of the university.

*The new universities were, in comparative terms, relatively lavishly funded. Professorial remuneration, never high despite the prestige of the academic profession in many countries, increased. Further, funds were available for research. For the first time, significant amounts of money were provided to the academic profession to pursue the new goals of the university.

It is important to pay some attention to the somewhat different pattern of development of the academic profession in the developing countries of the Third World, where close to half of today's professoriate teach. As noted earlier, the structures and orientations of European higher education were exported to the Third World. Even where Third World countries were not under colonial domination, such as Japan and China, Western models were chosen.[41] The academic profession, as a result, experienced problems of adapting to new institutions which were not necessarily strongly embedded in their societies. Building up traditions of academic freedom, orientations to research and the like has been difficult. In countries that were under colonial rule, the colonial universities were subservient to the will of the colonial power and the establishment of an independent academic profession was particularly difficult.[42] The academic profession of the Third World was affected by the academic revolution of the 19th century but much later than in was the case in Europe and North America.

The Sociology of the Professoriate

There are some important sociological variables which significantly affect the academic profession. While there are important national variations, it is nonetheless possible to make some generalizations. The professoriate is not drawn randomly from the population. The values and attitudes of the profession are also somewhat distinctive. These, and other, sociological variables help to shape the contemporary academic profession.

In most societies, the professoriate reflects a set of social class and other variables that are important in understanding the attitudes and orientations of the profession. For the most part, the academic profession is drawn from the middle and upper middle classes of society. Very few working class or poor rural people are able to have access to the lengthy education that is a necessary prerequisite for the professoriate. Further, the socialization patterns of the academic profession generally exclude working class individuals. Thus, the academic profession, like the other liberal professions of law and medicine, are almost exclusively the preserves of relatively privileged groups in society. Even where there is some mobility into the academic profession, individuals from modest social class origins tend not to reach the pinnacles of prestige in the profession. There has been somewhat more social class mobility in recent years, particularly in the larger academic systems such as the United States and the previous almost totally elite origins of the profession have slowly broken down. In most other countries, however and particularly in the Third World, there has been relatively little mobility. The social class origins of the profession has, of course, implications for the attitudes and values of the professoriate.

The academic profession has traditionally been completely dominated by males, and women have had a difficult time entering it.[43] Further, the small minority of women academics have had problems getting promoted to senior ranks. Fields in the sciences and in some of the professions have been particularly slow to admit women. For example, the number of female engineering staff remains extraordinarily low. Women can be found largely in "women's fields" such as education, social work, nursing and a few others. The humanities have been somewhat more open to women than most scientific fields. Women can be found largely in the lower ranks of the profession and mostly in the less prestigious institutions. While there are some significant differences along national lines, these generalizations apply to most countries. In the past decade, numbers of women students in graduate fields have grown and there has been a modest increase in women staff, but the pattern of exclusion and discrimination that has historically been the case seems to continue. The involvement of women in the academic profession generally and particularly in the senior ranks remains a key challenge, especially since numbers of women students are increasing rapidly.

The academic profession presents a broad configuration of values and attitudes (although for most countries there are very little data and so generalizations are necessarily tentative.) The most comprehensive data concerning the attitudes of the academic profession come from the United States and Britain, with smaller studies available elsewhere but with very little data from the Third World.[44] Academics present a somewhat unusual configuration of attitudes. Unlike most other fairly well paid professional groups, academics are generally more liberal in their politics than the mainstream of their societies and significantly to the left of other professional populations. Academics are not revolutionaries, but they are generally to the left of the mainstream. Significantly, the views of the professoriate concerning societal matters are considerably more liberal than their attitudes concerning the university. On academic matters, the profession is often rather conservative. There is, therefore, a kind of bifurcation of attitudes. On ideological and social policy questions, the professoriate stands in general to the left of the societal mainstream.

There are also significant attitude variations within the profession. For example, academics in the social sciences and humanities are significantly to the left of faculty in the sciences and especially those in applied fields like engineering, management and to some extent education. Law and medical faculty seems to stand between the liberals in the social sciences and the conservatives in engineering. At least in the United States, professors in the more prestigious institutions are more liberal than those at non elite schools.[45] The academic profession has a modest tendency to be somewhat critical of established authority. This is seemingly as true in the Soviet Union as it is in France or the Netherlands. On matters relating to the university, the profession tends to be somewhat conservative, perhaps fearing that change will weaken the traditional orientation of the universities. Academics support autonomy and academic freedom and they are often reluctant to support reform measures.

The configuration of social class and other background factors and the attitudes and values of the academic profession is very important in understanding the profession. For example, it would be unlikely for a largely urban and privileged professoriate to be able to deal with poor rural students. The attitudes of faculty toward both society and the university will predict how the profession will react to political and academic change.

The Social and Political Role of the Professoriate

The academic profession in many countries plays an important social and political role beyond the campus -- a role which is seldom understood or analyzed. The base of the professoriate's power is its expertise, the knowledge that professors have about issues which affect societal development. Professors have several other advantages as well. They are articulate and have training in communication, both orally and in writing. Indeed, one of the main campus-based roles of the professoriate is communication, and the skills gained in the classroom work well on television or at a government meeting. Professors also have more freedom to speak out on issues than most others in society. The norms of academic freedom provide considerable protection, even in societies which place restrictions on freedom of expression. The academic community is in most societies allowed considerable leeway. The professoriate also has the time to devote to intellectual participation, and such involvement is often seen as part of the professorial responsibility. Finally, the academic profession has financial and employment security through the tenure system which to some extent insulates it from external pressures.

Of course, there are also constraints on the external involvements of the professoriate, particularly when such participation is oppositional in nature. The protections of academic freedom are not total. Even in the United States, where the norms are well established, the academic community has from time to time suffered from external pressures. Political repression during the "McCarthy" period in the 1950s, for example, combined external pressure with internal controls.[46] In other countries, restrictions can be considerably more pervasive and severe. In some countries, the lack of a tenure system places the profession in some jeopardy.[47] In most Communist countries, restrictions on professorial writings and expression are well understood and professors are from time to time removed from their posts or even jailed for political reasons. Yet, even in this environment, academics have considerably more leeway to speak out than others in these societies. Internal university pressures, often quite subtle, may also militate against controversial statements or writings by professors. Junior staff who have non-mainstream positions and who speak out may find it difficult to secure promotion. Administrative sanctions may also be imposed and professors may find their teaching loads increased or their salary raises blocked. In sum, professorial involvement in societal affairs, particularly if such involvement is controversial, may have some costs. Despite these restrictions, however, the professoriate has significant freedom to speak out and write.

The bulk of professorial involvement is non-oppositional. Faculty members serve as consultants to a multitude of agencies, from governmental departments to industrial firms. In these roles, they serve as "experts", seeking to assist with their knowledge the agency involved.[48] The role of the "professor as expert" frequently involves the profession in social and political issues, from comments on environmental pollution to the analysis of public opinion surveys. The participation of academics in the development of nuclear weapons and then in helping to shape nuclear policy in the United States is an example of the extraordinarily important role that is sometimes played.

It seems clear that the academic community has increased in importance as participants in intellectual and political life. There are several reasons for this. The professoriate has grown in size and has become more diverse in recent years. A very significant proportion of the intellectual community has become part of the professoriate. Formerly independent intellectuals have become professors, valuing the steady income of an academic career. University based think-tanks and research centers have also become more central. Some previously independent journals have moved to the campus. In the United States, journals like the Partisan Review are based at universities, and the editors of many more political and cultural publications are professors. In the Third World countries, it is very likely that the majority of the nation's intellectuals hold academic positions and the academic community is without question the most important center of intellectual life. In Western Europe, there remains a stronger tradition of independent intellectual life, but even there the universities and the academic community has become more important in the intellectual life of the country.

Professors play a variety of roles in society. They are often critics, presenting new ideas and attacking established truths. The professorial critic is a time-honored role. Most often, criticism is presented through journal articles and other publications that have only a limited circulation. This permits criticism, even in somewhat restrictive societies, to be expressed without arousing significant unrest or concern by the authorities. If the criticism is substantively important, it is sometimes considered by the authorities or enters into the mainstream of debate in society. Professors also play a wider critical role. They write book reviews and opinion articles for newspapers and widely circulated magazines and these help to shape the cultural debate in a nation. They also have a role in stimulating (or inhibiting) the sales of books or films. While there has been no careful study, it seems evident that the proportion of academics writing in such publications as the New York Times Book Review or the Times Literary Supplement has grown in recent years. At times, professorial critics such as David Riesman,[49] whose concept of the "lonely crowd" was an intellectual milestone of the 1950s or Marshall McLuhan, whose ideas about mass communications influenced society a decade later, have a significant and lasting impact on debate.[50]

The political role of the professoriate is also important, although there are significant national variations. At the most dramatic level, professors occasionally serve as government officials. Examples abound. In Italy and Greece, many professors have served as ministers in the government. At least one Thai prime minister was a university professor. In France, half of the ruling Socialist party members of the Chamber of Deputies are either university academics or school teachers. Even in the United States, which has not had a tradition of involvement of academics in politics, at least one President (Wilson) and many cabinet members were drawn from campuses. During both the Kennedy and Nixon administrations, several cabinet members were academics.

Professors have very frequently served in appointed policy making positions in government and have, in these roles, exercised significant power. For example, in both Indonesia and Chile, groups of U.S.-trained economists (the Berkeley and Chicago "Mafia" respectively) are said to have had shaped these countries' economic policies. In the Soviet Union, Gorbachov's chief economics advisor is a professor. It is very common for academics to be appointed to key positions for limited periods of time. Typically, they will take leaves from their universities and return to academic posts when their work in government has been completed. Professors can be found in virtually every field of government. Even America's "drug Czar" is a former professor.

Professorial writings often articulate oppositional positions or provide critiques of established policies. On occasion, academics can become very influential through their writings. The example of Fang Lizhi, a professor of astrophysics and one of China's most influential opposition thinkers, is relevant here. Professors sometimes function as opposition figures on the campus. They may become mentors or even leaders of student protest groups. Through their teaching, they may help to mobilize opposition ideas in the university. On very rare occasions, professors may organize anti-regime activities on campus. This occurred in the United States, for example, during the war in Vietnam. The role of the professor as an oppositional thinker and activist is an important one. Although only a very small minority of academics are involved in such oppositional activity, professorial leadership is highly influential. Because they are articulate writer and speakers, academic critics lend legitimacy to oppositional movements.

The role of the professor as expert very often has political implications. As noted, academics are sometimes called on to join the government to provided relevant expertise. Professors very frequently serve as consultants on issues which are directly related to the formation or implement of policy. Here their expertise also has political implications. In many countries, the academic community provides the most important expertise to most, if not all, efforts to formulate and sometimes to implement policy.

The role of the professor in politics is by no means a new phenomenon, although it has grown in importance as the range of expertise in the universities has increased and as academic institutions have become more important as foci of intellectual life. Nationalist ideas percolated from the universities in 19th century Europe and then in the colonized areas of the Third World . Professors were directly involved in the nationalist revolutions of 1848 in Europe. Academics were then very much a part of the political and economic development of Germany in the second half of the 19th century in transforming the universities, contributing to the research that formed the basis of the German industrial revolution and in advising the government on a variety of matters, including the establishment of the world's first social security system.[51] The academic community has been involved in many of the anti-colonial struggles in the Third World.

The professorial role in politics is a widespread and important one. Whether as activist or expert, professors play a key role. Their expertise, ability to communicate and their access to the mass media and those in power make them a powerful but generally unacknowledged force in many societies. In the Third World, there literacy rates are often low and the educated population small, the academic community is even more powerful.

Promotion and Remuneration in Academe

Professors are not only concerned about their societal role but also about conditions in the university. Consideration of two important aspects of the 'internal life' of the academic profession relate to promotion and remuneration. While there are a few generalizations that can be made about these topics, there are many variations by institution and by country. This discussion will attempt to point to the broader elements and to highlight some of the differences. The selection and promotion of incumbents to the profession is one of the academic community's most important responsibilities. It is one that it taken with the utmost seriousness almost everywhere. And it is a responsibility that the profession has tried, with a good deal of success of the centuries, to control as part of the concept of university autonomy. The norm is that the academic profession should control the criteria for selection, the process of selection, and the promotion of academic staff.

While the profession has retained, to a considerable degree control over hiring and promotion, there is an inevitable tension between autonomy and accountability. External authorities control, in most universities, the total number of academic positions and often the allocation of those positions to departments and specialties. Positions may be reallocated or eliminated. External criteria may be imposed in the selection process of a position. For example, West German (and some American) universities require a loyalty oath from academics, American universities sometimes impose 'affirmative action' guidelines which give preference to specific racial or gender groups, and academic selection in Socialist countries often involve ideological criteria. In many academic institutions managed by religious organizations such as the Roman Catholic Church, doctrinal loyalty is sometimes demanded of academic staff. Governmental or university policy makers may feel that the addition of a professorship in, for example, management studies may be more useful than maintaining a faculty position in Latin, and positions are shifted. Decisions concerning the rank of positions may also be determined by external authority. Governmental decisions sometimes affect the possibility of promotion of staff when quotas are placed on the numbers of positions in specific ranks or budgetary allocations for positions. Such restrictions may affect the configuration of the profession, as in Britain where governmentally imposed ceilings on appointments to senior ranks have meant that many academics cannot proceed through the normal career route regardless of length of service or merit. Thus, while the academic profession has been able to maintain a considerable element of control over appointment and promotion of staff, there are inevitable restrictions from the outside.

The hallmark of the appointment and promotion process is meritocracy. The norm is that the university should seek to appoint the best possible person for any position. The concept of meritocracy in appointments and promotions is at the heart of the entire ideal of the academic profession. Excellence in teaching and in research are what is to be sought in any academic appointment. As noted, however, meritocracy is seldom pure and unfettered by some other considerations. Most academic appointments require the the highest degree available in the field--normally the doctorate, although there are many exceptions. A few academic systems, such as Japan, where the doctorate is not always awarded at the end of graduate study, do not require this degree.[52] Exceptions are made in many countries for appointees who may not have obtained the relevant advanced degree but who have other relevant skills. Academic systems which are rapidly expanding and cannot locate a sufficient number of doctoral degree holders may not require the degree. Nonetheless, the norm for academic appointments is the doctoral degree. It is considered important for appointees to have the knowledge and the experience in research and writing that the doctorate entails. The profession also wants assurance that the incumbents are appropriately socialized in the norms and values of the profession, and it is felt that doctoral study provides this socialization process.

The process of promotion in academe is in many university systems a complex one. The profession takes this process seriously and considerable resources are often invested in it. There are also significant national variations. A key element in every academic system is the length of time in spent in rank.[53] In many academic systems, promotions from one rank to another are fairly routine and are based on time in position although promotion to the most senior rank, the full professorship, is often highly competitive. All academic systems are based on a series of ranks for the academic staff. While the titles vary, there are typically three or four specific ranks in the academic hierarchy, with the most junior rank being made without tenure and on a "probationary" basis. The most senior rank is generally the full professorship. In some systems, the probationary period is relatively short and the process of "confirmation" not very difficult.

Traditionally, in Britain, a junior lecturer was confirmed in his or her position after three years. With this confirmation came tenured status but not necessarily guarantee of promotion into the senior ranks. India and many other countries follow a similar arrangement, with junior appointments made on a probationary basis but with confirmation (with significantly weaker guarantees of tenure) taking place after a few years. The United States has perhaps the longest and most competitive process of tenure. The most junior academic appointee, the assistant professor, is typically hired for a total of six years at that rank. An extensive review after six years examines aspects of teaching and research as well as whether the incumbent fits the needs of the department and if this process is positive, then a promotion in rank to the position of associate professor, usually with tenure, is made. A similar evaluation is made at the time of promotion from associate to full professor, although there is no standard time at which this occurs. However, in the American academic system, it is assumed that most academics will end their careers as full professors, the top academic rank. This is in contrast to most other academic systems in the industrialized nations , where there is typically only one full professor in each department and as a result appointment to this rank is somewhat unusual. In some academic systems, such as Italy, promotion to the senior ranks requires a national competition in each instance and the process is very complicated and often time consuming.

In much of Europe, the distinction of being appointed a full professor is quite considerable. In the Soviet Union, for example, all full professor appointments must be approved by the Minister of Education and are, formally, by the government as well as by the University. From the junior to the middle ranks, promotion is made on the basis of a combination of satisfactory service for a period of time and some consideration of academic distinction. Even in the highly competitive American system, most of those considered for promotion from assistant to associate professors are in fact promoted. In many universities, virtually everyone who successfully completes the probationary period is advanced in rank and offered a permanent (tenured) appointment.

Tenure, or permanent appointment, is itself a complicated and multifaceted concept. Tenure is the norm in most countries and is sought by most academics. Indeed, it has been said that the considerable job security that the academic profession offers is a kind of trade-off for salaries that are lower than equivalents for other highly educated professions. In a small minority of countries, there is no tenure system and academics do not have permanent appointments. Taiwan, for example , does not provide tenure to its professors. Britain, in 1988, abolished tenure for new appointees in the most dramatic departure from the norm in modern times. There has also been criticism of the tenure system in many countries, claiming that it inhibits productivity and flexibility in the academic system.[54] In some cases, as in West Germany, tenure is granted to academics directly by the government (in this instance the governments of the various German states) since the professors are senior civil servants. In other cases, tenure is given by the university itself. Tenure provides the promise of permanent employment until the normal time of retirement (which can vary from no mandatory age as is now being implemented in the United States as a result of a Supreme Court decision against age discrimination to very rigid retirement as low as 55 in some Third World nations) under normal circumstances. Tenure can be abrogated for a variety of reasons in most countries. In the United States, where tenure is more of a tradition than a legally binding commitment, tenured staff can be fired for many reasons, ranging from fiscal problems in the university to the abolition of departments or specialties for programmatic reasons. Generally, the courts have upheld the violation of tenure commitments if established policies and procedures were used. Universities, in almost all countries, can remove tenure from an individual professor for "cause"--usually defined as serious dereliction of duty or violation of academic norms. Tenure can even be abrogated for political reasons -- in violation of protections of academic freedom -- on some occasions. In the United States, professors were removed from their positions for political reasons during the McCarthy period in the 1950s.[55] Such violations of tenure for political reasons are common in periods of political stress in the Third World. Tenure, which refers to the expectation of permanent employment, and the ideal of academic freedom have become intertwined and often confused in many countries.[56] In general, both academic freedom and tenure have stronger protections in the industrialized nations of the West, where academic traditions are strong and the professoriate has a high degree of prestige, although it should be pointed out that both were quickly destroyed without significant public outcry in Germany during the Nazi period and violations in the United States during the McCarthy era.

Remuneration is, of course, an important but little discussed aspect of the academic profession and a matter of considerable concern to the professoriate. There are significant variations in the nature of remuneration in different academic systems but there are also some generalizations. The academic profession is not as well paid as other top professions in most societies. When compared to the amount of formal education required or to its social prestige , the academic profession does not compare favorably with other similar occupational groups in terms of its remuneration. Typically, professors trade high salaries for other non-monetary benefits such as considerable security of tenure, professional autonomy and a less pressured life-style. While the professoriate is not as well paid as comparable occupational groups in their societies, academics in most countries can lead secure middle-class lifestyles. Thus, academics, while not among the most affluent members of their societies, are certainly not at the bottom of the income range.

There are significant internal variations in remuneration in many countries. Without exception, junior staff are paid less than senior staff. Indeed, even in academic systems where "merit" is part of the salary allocation process, the main determinant of salary level is seniority and length of service in a particular rank. It should also be noted that most academic systems have fairly rigid salary schedules and there is relatively little variation among professors of similar rank and length of service. Further, while there are often rather sharp breaks in terms of the salary structure between the academic ranks, within ranks salary increased while steady are not very rapid. It seems fairly typical for the most senior professors to earn double or even triple the incomes of the most junior incumbents. There are sometimes significant variations in remuneration based on academic field or discipline. Such variations are less evident in academic systems which have rigid salary structures. In the United State, which has one of the least rigid structures, professors in "high demand" fields and particularly in field which must compete directly with non-academic employers, have significantly higher salaries than professors in more traditional academic areas. For example, professors of management and computer science earn more than faculty in philosophy or English literature. It is perhaps significant that there are many more academic systems that determine salary mostly on the basis of seniority and rank than those which include "merit" as a primary criteria for remuneration. Many academic systems have maxima for particular ranks, and movement from rank to rank involves considerable competition and an evaluation of merit and productivity. It should also be noted that there are some variations in the different levels of a national academic system. In many countries, the apex universities are better paid than other academic institutions although there are also countries which treat all of the institutions within categories the same. For example, Oxford dons are paid on the same basic salary scale at their colleagues at Sussex or Reading. There are variations typically between the levels in the system. University professors will often have more generous scales than faculty in teachers colleges or polytechnics. In some countries, unions play a role in determining salaries and other conditions of work for the professoriate.

There are significant variations in remuneration from country to country. Salary levels are, of course, an important indication of the prestige and role of the academic profession although, as noted earlier, the profession generally has more prestige and respect than salary would indicate. Most most of the Western industrialized countries, academics earn salaries that rank them in the upper reaches of the middle class but not in the top economic categories. The Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands have been particularly generous to their professors in recent years. The United States, West Germany and France rank somewhat below the top but nonetheless provide fairly high levels of remuneration. Japan, in an interesting variation on the theme, pays the professors at the prestigious national universities less than private universities pay, in part because it is assumed that the national university professors will have access to other sources of income. Britain has typically ranked somewhat below the norms for the other industrialized nations, particularly for the lower ranks of the the profession and its salary levels have suffered dramatically in recent years, causing a "brain drain" from British universities in some fields where there is high demand overseas.

There is even more variation in Third World countries. In some countries, academics are well paid, even when compared to international standards. In others, academic salaries are so low that university teachers must have additional employment. As in the industrialized nations, the academic profession in the Third World has high prestige, in some cases stemming from the traditional respect given to learning as in the cultures of both China and India and in other instances from the association of universities and of the academic profession with modernity and with the power and status of the bureaucracy.

Even where academic salaries are relatively high, it is very difficult for Third World universities to keep their best professors in the profession. The attraction of outside employment in a high government position or in the private sector is very strong and such jobs invariably pay better than an academic post. Because of the scarcity of highly skilled personnel, there is often considerable competition for the best academic talent. Third World academics can often earn considerably higher salaries in the industrialized nations than they can at home and this has resulted in a considerable "brain drain" of professors to the West.

There are also variations in professorial remuneration in terms of type of institution. In general, the apex universities (generally those which focus on graduate education and research and which have the highest prestige) pay the highest salaries. They offer their academic staffs the best working conditions in terms of teaching responsibilities, access to laboratories, and the like. A partial exception to this rule is Japan, where the top public universities typically pay lower salaries than some of the less prestigious private institutions. In the United States, for example, remuneration in the three sectors of the public university system in California varies according to institutional prestige and function, with the University of California system paying the most, followed by the largely undergraduate California State University and then the two-year community college system.

It is difficult to compare accurately academic remuneration in different countries. In some instances, very high social prestige substitutes for direct payment. In others, the university provides other benefits, such as free or subsidized housing, education for children and the like. A professor in Canada has a much higher salary and better living conditions than a professor in a graduate department in a university in India. However, when compared to the average life style for people in the two countries, the Indian professor is comparatively better off. The relatively low salaries of professors in the Japanese public universities is also misleading since these top academics can supplement their incomes by writing and speaking.

It is possible to tell a great deal about the academic profession by examining remuneration and promotion policies and practices. In the last analysis, the morale and performance of the academic profession is as much determined by these mundane details of academic life as by principles of academic freedom.

Professorial Case Studies

It may be useful to discuss several national case studies of the professoriate in order to illustrate some of the themes discussed in this essay. These brief discussions cannot present a full understanding of the role and status of the academic profession in these countries but nonetheless may yield some useful insights. The American professoriate is the largest in the world, with about 440,000 full time academics in some 3,000 institutions of higher learning. It is also a highly differentiated profession, including community college teachers who are closer to secondary school teachers in their working conditions and status than to the Harvard faculty as well as academics at four year institutions of varying quality and graduate-oriented universities which stand at the apex of the academic system.

The American professoriate enjoyed unprecedented growth during the 1960s. Its numbers expanded and salaries increased as well. Social prestige also went up. The more recent period has been one of the considerable strain.[57] Fiscal problems and enrollments declines meant that there were few academic jobs available. Salaries, measured against inflation, actually decreased. Research funding declined. Demands for accountability meant that traditional ideas academic autonomy were under attack. The American academic profession has tried, with some success, to retain its autonomy and its morale under these new and more difficult circumstances. Given the stresses, it is somewhat surprising that the academic profession has changed so little in the past decade and that it has exhibited a remarkable stability.[58]

In Japan, the academic profession is very highly regarded and it is central to the nation's intellectual life. Indeed, the professors in the prestige sectors of the academic system are veritable intellectual Mandarins who are arbiters of the nation's intellectual life. The Japanese academic profession is highly differentiated, however, with the bulk of the professoriate in most of the private universities and the smaller and less well established public institutions having a significantly lower status than those at the top universities.[59] The academic system is less competitive and there is very little professorial mobility. Many professors teach at the university from which they graduated, contributing to a problem of "inbreeding."[60] The profession is organized hierarchically, according to the traditional German-style "chair" system, which permits only one full professor per academic department or discipline. It also gives to the full professors tremendous power over the rest of the staff assigned to the "chair." There has been immense pressure in recent years for reform in Japanese higher education and for a "democratization" of the academic profession. However, there has been very little change in either the organizational structure or the orientation of the professoriate and the universities.[61]

The Japanese professoriate faces some difficulties in the coming period. There is pressure for the Japanese universities to "modernize", to make their structures more democratic and to facilitate interdisciplinary work. Many critics have pointed to the conservatism of the academic profession as a stumbling block. The Japanese "educational miracle", in general, has not included the universities. So far, the professoriate, especially at the top institutions, has refused to change. The academic profession has very high prestige, the protection of a very strong tenure system, and a university structure that permits a great deal of autonomy.

The academic community most under threat in the industrialized nations is, surprisingly, Britain. With its very strong academic tradition and history of considerable autonomy for the professoriate, the British academic profession would not seem to be a target.[62] Yet, in the 1980s, the British professoriate has undergone considerable change. The responsibility for these changes lies with the Thatcher government which has sought to control costs in higher education, to bring the universities and the non-university postsecondary institutions (mainly the polytechnics) closer together and in general to introduce more accountability into the academic system. Several major changes have been legislated and are now being implemented. The traditional means of funding the universities, the University Grants Committee (UGC), which was dominated by professors and which ensured a considerable degree of autonomy has been abolished and replaced by the Universities Funding Council which is directly under the control of the Ministry of Education and Science. In recent years, the government has engaged in a series of evaluations of academic programs in the universities that have included criteria of both quality and need, and as a result some departments and specialties have been curtailed or even eliminated. Institutions in the non-university sector have been merged or abolished. Perhaps most important, and controversial, was a decision to do away with academic tenure for new appointments. Academic staff, including professors, will have renewable term contracts. In addition to these changes, academic salaries in Britain have not kept pace with inflation, promotions have been in part frozen and few new posts have been authorized.

The professoriate in the Third World faces some special challenges based on historical circumstances and current realities. As noted earlier,the tradition of academic autonomy is in general weaker in the Third World than in the industrialized countries in part because universities are newer and more fragile institutions and in part because of colonial academic subservience.[63] This means that the profession has less autonomy and fewer guarantees of academic freedom. In many countries, funding is a problem since universities must compete with many other societal institutions in a context of scarcity. The infrastructures of universities, including libraries and laboratories, are weaker and this has made the development of research capability more difficult. For all of these reasons, the academic profession in the Third World faces some special challenges.

The profession itself does not function with full autonomy, not only because of governmental and other local restrictions but because it exists in a peripheral relationships to the academic communities in the industrialized nations. Scholars rely on basic research and knowledge produced at the centers and must participate in an international knowledge system over which they have little control.[64]

For these and other reasons, the academic profession in the Third World faces special problems and challenges. Despite these problems, however, Third World universities continue to expand. They are immensely important institutions in their societies. Third World academics often play a very important role in their societies, as leaders and experts as well as teachers. Their situation is both precarious and powerful.

The Professoriate as an International Community

The academic profession is firmly embedded in national institutions and traditions. Yet, it is truly an international profession. Each national academic profession has common historical roots that have an international dimension. Contemporary academic culture is also international. The 'invisible college" of scholars who provide leadership in all academic disciplines is an international college.[65] It consists of scholars from many countries. The international knowledge system is also international. Books and journals are circulated worldwide. New on-line data banks and networks are also international in scope and are used worldwide. This international knowledge network, and the academic profession in general, is dominated by scholars at the major apex universities in the West.

The network functions largely in English (and to some extent in French, Spanish and Russian) as it once used Latin as the international medium of communication for scholars.

The international academic community is one of hierarchies. The power of the apex institutions is immense and the role of the dominant journals and publications is also great. The institutions in the industrialized nations of the West dominate the system. Even in the West, the most prestigious universities and the professors at these institutions tend to provide leadership. They have the primary role in research and in the dissemination of knowledge.

Despite inequalities, the international knowledge system, it is very valuable. It means that not only knowledge but also the academic profession sees itself in a context beyond the often limiting boundaries of the nation state. It identifies with a wider community of scholars and with a research base that has worldwide implications.

The academic profession looks not only to its local circumstances but also to a wider historical tradition and sense of international colleagueship. Local circumstances may sometimes be difficult, but an international consciousness may help to permit a wider perspective. The contemporary academic profession faces many challenges. But it functions in a situation where knowledge is ever more important as the basis of modern society and the world economy. The professoriate is one of the main producers and transmitters of knowledge. Just as important, it is the key credentialing agent for most of the professions and occupations that permit modern societies to function. Thus, the academic profession and the university of which it is the most important part face difficulties but in a context of optimism.*

Footnotes

*I am indebted to Lionel Lewis and James Coffman for their comments on an earlier version of this essay.

1. Edward Shils, The Academic Ethic (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
2. Fritz Ringer, The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Academic Community, 1890-1933 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969).
3. Harold Perkin, Key Profession: A History of the A. U. T. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969).
4. Helene Wieruszowski, The Medieval University (Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1966).
5. For case studies, see Philip G. Altbach, ed., Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession (New York: Praeger, 1977) and Burton Clark, ed. The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary and Institutional Settings (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1987).
6. Richard Pelczar, "The Latin American Professoriate: Progress and Prospects," in Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession, pp. 125-144.
7. Irene Gilbert, "The Indian Academic Profession: The Origins of a Tradition of Subordination," Minerva 10 (July 1972), pp. 384-411.
8. See Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, The American University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973).
9. T. R. McConnell, "Autonomy and Accountability: Some Fundamental Issues," in Higher Education in American Society, ed. Philip G. Altbach and Robert Berdahl (Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1987), pp. 39-58.
10. Peter Sheldrake and Russell Linke, eds., Accountability in Higher Education (Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin, 1979).
11. Charles H. Haskins, The Rise of Universities (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965).
12. Hastings Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895).
13. Joseph Ben-David, Centers of Learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977).
14. See Laurence J. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).
15. Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

16. See Burton Clark, The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds (Princeton, N. J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987). From a different perspective, see Lionel Lewis, Scaling the Ivory Tower (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975).
17. Robert Nisbet, The Degradation of the Academic Dogma: The University in America, 1945-1970 (New York: Basic Books, 1971).
18. Alvin Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals-I," Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (December 1957), pp. 281-306.
19. Martin Trow, "The Expansion and Transformation of Higher Education," International Review of Education, 18 (1972) pp. 61-82.
20. Guy Neave, "The Changing Face of the Academic Profession in Western Europe," European Journal of Education 18 (No. 3, 1983), pp. 217-228.
21. See Peter Scott, "The State of the Academic Profession in Britain," European Journal of Education 18 (No. 3, 1983), pp. 245-258.
22. For a broader perspective on this issue, see Graeme Moodie, "The Disintegrating Chair: Professors in Britain Today," European Journal of Education 21 (No. 1, 1986), pp. 43-56.
23. Peter Scott, The Crisis of the University (London: Croom Helm, 1984).
24. Gunnar Bergendal, "Simplicity or Multiplicity: A Swede's Outlook on Higher Education," European Journal of Education 19 (No. 2, 1984), pp.183-192.
25. For an overview, see Philip G. Altbach, Higher Education in the Third World, (New York: Advent Books, 1987).
26. Edward Shils, "Academic Freedom," in International Encyclopedia of Comparative Higher Education (New York: Garland, in press).
27. Charles H. Haskins, The Rise of Universities.
28. See John W. Baldwin and Richard A. Goldthwaite, eds., Universities in Politics: Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972).
29. Ibid.
30. Joseph Ben-David and A. Zloczower, "Universities and Academic Systems in the Modern World," European Journal of Sociology 3 (1985), pp. 45-85.
31. Edith H. Altbach, "Vanguard of Revolt: Students and Politics in Central Europe, 1815-1848," in Students in Revolt, eds., S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach (Boston: Beacon, 1969), pp. 451-474.
32. A. J. Engel, From Clergyman to Don: The Rise of the Academic Profession in Nineteenth-Century Oxford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

33. J. Ben-David and A. Zloczower, "Universities and Academic Systems," pp. 52-53.
34. See Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Vintage, 1965).
35. Samuel D. Kassow, Students, Professors and the State in Tsarist Russia.(Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1989).
36. Joseph Ben-David and A. Zloczower, "Universities and Academic Systems."
37. Fritz Ringer, The Decline of the German Mandarins.
38. Laurence Veysey, The Emergence of the American University.
39. Edmund Pincoffs, ed., The Concept of Academic Freedom (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1972).
40. Laurence Veysey, The Emergence of the American University.
41. See Ruth Hayhoe, "China's Universities and Western Academic Models" in From Dependence to Autonomy: The Development of Asian Universities, eds. P. G. Altbach and V. Selvaratnam. (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer, 1989), pp. 25-62.
42. Eric Ashby, Universities: British, Indian, African (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966).
43. Margaret Sutherland, Women Who Teach in Universities (Trentham, England: Trentham Books, 1985).
44. For example, see A. H. Halsey and M. Trow, The British Academics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), Martin Trow, ed., Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset, The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), R. Suvanajata, The Thai Professorial Role (Bangkok: National Institute of Development Administration, 1975) and Suma Chitnis and P. G. Altbach, eds., The Indian Academic Profession (New Delhi: Macmillan, 1979).
45. E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset, Professors and Politics.
46. Ellen Schrecker, No Ivory Towers: McCarthyism and the Universities (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986). See also Lionel Lewis, Cold War on Campus (New Brunswick, N. J.: Transaction, 1988).
47. Philip G. Altbach, "Academic Freedom in Asia: Learning the Limitations," Far Eastern Economic Review (June 16, 1988), pp. 24-25.
48. E. T. Silva and S. Slaughter, Serving Power: The Making of the American Social Science Expert (Westport, Ct.: Greenwood, 1984).
49. David Riesman, et al., The Lonely Crowd (Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Books, 1953).
50. Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

51. Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society and University in Germany, 1700-1914* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
52. William Cummings, "Understanding Behavior in Japan's Academic Marketplace," *Journal of Asian Studies* 34 (1975), pp. 313-340.
53. Lionel Lewis, *Scaling the Ivory Tower*.
54. Bardwell Smith, et al., *The Tenure Debate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973).
55. Ellen Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*.
56. See Walter Metzger, "Academic Freedom in Delocalized Academic Institution," in *Higher Education in American Society*, pp. 59-76 and Sheila Slaughter, "Academic Freedom in the Modern University:, *Ibid*., pp. 77-106 for a discussion of the complexities of tenure and academic freedom in the American context.
57. Howard Bowen and Jack Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
58. Burton Clark, *The Academic Life*.
59. William Cummings and Ikuo Amano, "The Changing Role of the Japanese Professor," in *Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession*, pp. 43-67.
60. M. Shimbori, "Comparative Study of Career Patterns of College Professors," *International Review of Education* 10 (1964), pp. 284-296.
61. William Cummings and Ikuo Amano, "The Changing Role of the Japanese Professor."
62. Peter Scott, *The Crisis of the University*.
63. See Philip G. Altbach and V. Selvaratnam, eds., *From Dependence to Autonomy*.
64. Philip G. Altbach, "The University as Center and Periphery," *Teachers College Record* 82 (Summer, 1981), pp. 601-621.
65. Diana Crane, *Invisible Colleges: Diffusion of Knowledge in Scientific Communities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972).

STUDENT POLITICAL ACTIVISM

Philip G. Altbach

Student political activism is a highly complex, many faceted phenomenon. It is very difficult to explain and even more problematic to predict. It is not surprising that there is no overarching theoretical explanation for it. Yet, understanding the configurations of student politics is important. Political leaders would do well not only to listen to student protest movements but also to understand their dynamics, since regimes have been threatened or even toppled by student protests. The academic community also needs to understand student activism, as students have from time to time been key actors in movements for university reform and have also disrupted academic institutions. And the activists themselves should be fully aware of the history, politics and potential of student protest movements since, as has often been said, those who do not know the past are doomed to repeat it. This essay will posit some general perspectives on student politics although it will stop short of that elusive goal of developing a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding student movements.

It is difficult enough to understand the saga of student movements in a single country -- it is far more problematic to focus on the phenomenon in a worldwide perspective. Yet, this essay will consider student movements in a comparative context. This approach will permit us to focus with a much wider lens on student activism and to gain a broader understanding of the key issues. Student protest is a national phenomenon, or even an institutional one, for the most part, but there are nonetheless some useful cross-national comparisons to be made. Further, the experience of one country may well be valuable in understanding the situation in another.

The Historical Context

Student political activism did not start in the 1960s although much of the research and analysis on the subject dates from that turbulent decade. There are several key examples of student political involvement in the past that are not only historically significant but which also indicate broader trends in student politics.

Students have had a longstanding romance with nationalism, and some of the earliest important student movements were related to nationalism. Students were an important force in the revolutionary movements of 1848 in Germany.[1] While the 1848 struggles were not primarily student movements, students, professors and intellectuals played a key role. The academic community was particularly concerned with pressing for democratic rights against absolute monarchies and in developing a broader nationalist focus for the movements, especially in the German states. Indeed, the nationalist ideology developed out of the 1848 movement provided a very powerful force in the unification of Germany later in the 19th century and strongly influenced the movement for Italian unification around the same time. Perhaps related to the student nationalist focus in the 19th century, student organizations were again supportive of the natinalist-based Fascist and Nazi movements in the 1920s and 1930s in Italy and Germany. Indeed, German student organizations were among the first groups to support Hitler.[2]

Nationalism also was a key motivating force during the colonial period in Africa and Asia. Virtually every nationalist and independence struggle had a strong component of student participation. In some instances, the university community was in the leaderhsip in terms of articulating a vision of an independent nation and culture while in orders students were key players in the movement.[3] Frequently, students who were educated abroad were actively involved in the articulation of nationalist sentiments. The development of the concept of Indonesian nationhood and of a national language for the country emerged from a group of student intellectuals and became the basis for a successful nationalist struggle.[4] Students in countries as diverse as India, Kenya, Vietnam and Burma were involved in efforts to free their countries of colonial rule. China, while never under direct colonial rule, was pressed by foreign powers. Students, in 1911 and on several other occasions, spearheaded nationalist and revolutionary movements with the intention of modernizing China.[5] While it is true that students were not the primary leaders of any of the anti-colonial nationalist movements, they were in many cases very active and influential in them.[6]

Student activism is generally oppositional in nature, but it was not always on the left. In the cases of Germany and Italy, students supported rightist nationalist causes. In the Third World, nationalism was often leftist in orientation, frequently influenced by Marxist ideas and students frequently constituted the left-wing of more moderate nationalist movements. But students at times were "cultural nationalists" and were not necessarily leftist in their orientation. In short, student movement were often radical in orientation, but not universally so.

Students were also involved in academic matters. The most powerful and influential university reform movement was led by students -- the Latin American reform movement of 1918. The movement, which began in Argentina and spread throughout the continent, reflected the growth of the Latin American middle class and had far-reaching consequences for the university, which was transformed to include the students in the process of governance, and for society as well.[7] The tradition of the 1918 reform movement continued as a powerful force for a half century.

In the West, with the exception of the student role in the revolutionary struggles of 1848, students were not a major force in politics until the 1960s. There were occasional upsurges of student political involvement, but they were sporadic and while they had a considerable impact in the universities, the political system was not significantly affected by student activism. Students were active in some European countries during the Depression years of the 1930s -- on both left and right. The rightist trends in Germany and Italy have been noted and some French students were also involved with right-wing student movements. In most other industrialized nations, students were generally on the political left. In the United States, which experienced a major student political movement during the 1930s, student organizations were exclusively liberal or radical.[8] Students were much more of a force in some Third World nations in the historical as well as the contemporary context. They were highly influential in nationalist movements and were considered to be a legitimate part of the political equation.

Historically, student political involvement was sporadic and generally not crucial to political developments. With a few notable exceptions such as those mentioned here, students were not a deciding factor. In the West, student movements arose from time to time. The have predicted spectific upsurges would have been very difficult, and it is difficult to discern historical patterns in a comparative framework. In the colonized nations, students were a more constant force and had a greater impact.

The Impossibility of a "Permanent Revolution" in the University

One of the key characteristics of student activist movements is their sporadic nature. Student movements generally last only a short time -- a year or two is unusual although there are instances of more sustained activism. Just as it is difficult to predict the rise of activist movements, it is as great a challenge to predict their demise. There are a variety of structural and perhaps psychological reasons for this situation. The rhythm of academic life is both a help and hinderance to activist movements. Student life, in most academic systems, permits a good deal of free time. This time can be devoted to politics. In the traditional European systems, examinations were infrequent and the pace of studies was almost entirely determined by the student. This meant that student leaders could devote themselves exclusively to politics and still maintain their student status. In the more regulated American system, with its frequent examinations and the course-credit system, sustained activism is more difficult.[9] It is perhaps not surprising that many academic systems, particularly in the Third World, have been shifting from the laissez faire European system to the more regulated American pattern. In the American system, the "permanent student" syndrome, which is evident in some European and Third World nations, is very difficult and student leadership, as a result, is more transitory. It is clear that the structural realities of academic life in a specific academic system can have a significant impact on the nature and longevity of student movements.

Student "generations" are short and this makes sustained campus political movements difficult, since both leaders and followers change. Undergraduate generations change every three or four years. Further, even in the most laissez faire academic system, pressure to pass examinations and complete degrees is intense toward the end of the program, and students are less likely to be involved in activist movements.[10] The rapid turnover of participants makes it difficult to sustain a movement. Further, campus generations may have quite different orientations and interests, and the "tradition" of activism is sometimes transitory. On the other hand, student movements may be impatient for results precisely because the leadership realizes that the movement may be short-lived. On issues relating to university reform or campus conditions, there is often a special desire to achieve results so that the current student generation can benefit from the change.

Sociological factors also militate against sustained student movements. In most countries, university students are from relatively affluent sections of the populations. In the industrialized nations, and to some extent in the Third World as well, the issues which stimulate student political activism are of broad political questions, sometimes related to ideological matters. Students are not, frequently, struggling for their own direct benefit but rather for idealistic causes. This may mean that they are less deeply committed to the struggle than if they were fighting for an issue that would directly affect their lives. The often idealistic nature of student movements may be both a stimulus and a limiting factor for sustained student activism. For a variety of reasons, student activist movements are generally not sustained beyond an academic year or two and seldom lead to permanent organizations or to political parties. Further, although student movements frequently try to link up with organizations, movements of political parties outside the universities, these links are not usually successful or, even if made, do not often last very long.

Responses to Activism

One of the reasons that student movements are not sustained relates to the outside response to activism. Student movements seldom function in a purely campus environment.[11] They are often concerned with wide political or social issues and consciously try to influence developments beyond the university. Even when the movement is campus-focused, the impact frequently extends beyond the university. Student movements depend, to some extent at least, on the reaction of the society to activism. On some occasions, particularly in the Third World, campus activism relates directly to key political issues in the society and leads to significant social unrest and, sometimes, contributes to the downfall of the regime. This is unusual in the industrialized world. However, student movements depend on the reactions of the mass media, on key social groups outside the universities and on other extra-campus factors.[12] When the students are reflecting an important social concern, such as for example the issue of civil rights in the United States in the early 1960s, they are likely to attract both the attention of the mass media and the support of significant segments of the population. American students helped to stimulate both the civil rights movement and the struggle against the war in Vietnam in the 1960s precisely because they are articulating wider social concerns.[13]

Where student activism is traditionally accepted as a legitimate element of the political system it is more likely that activism will have an impact on the society. In many Third World nations, where students were an important part of independence movements and have an established place in the society's political mythology, activist movements are seen as a "normal" part of the political system.[14] In the industrialized nations, student movements are not seen as legitimate political actors and society and the established authorities react with less sympathy to student activism generally. The historical traditions of activism play a role in how society responds to student movements.

The relationship between the mass media and student activism is a complex and important one. In the industrialized nations, the response of the mass media to activism has been a key factor in determining the impact of student movements. During the 1960s, the media gave student politics quite a bit of attention in many nations and student demonstrations were featured in the press and on television. The message of the activists was disseminated. At other times, the media has ignored student politics, relegating it to a phenomenon relevant only to the universities. In this situation, it is very difficult for activists to extend their influence beyond the campus. It is frequently difficult to predict either the nature of the scope of media attention. For example, student efforts to force universities to give up their investments in South Africa in the 1980s received considerable attention from the mass media while campus protests against United States foreign policy in Central America did not get as much converage. It helps if the protests take place at the center of political power -- as was the case in France when student demonstrated against proposed educational reforms. Student activist leaders often try to engender media attention since they recognize that they need media coverage.

Government response to student activism is also of great importance. Such response can range from ignoring student protests entirely to violently repressing demonstrations. In the West, the general predeliction of government authorities is to ignore student protests and let university authorities handle them. Only when demonstrations are quite substantial do they engender response. Western governments, in general, do not accept student protests as a legitimate political expression and they try to ignore them. With some notable exceptions, governmental authorities try to deal with student protests in the least volatile way possible, although violence frequently occurs, leading often to increased student militancy and attracting added sympathy.

Violent repression of student activism is more characteristic of the Third World, where student movements are seen as a direct threat to the political system. Repression can sometimes put an end to demonstrations and stifle a movement, but it also has the potential for increasing both the size and the militancy of the activist movements. For example, repression of student demonstrations in Argentina and Uruguay contributed to the rise of urban guerilla movements which caused considerable disruption and unrest. Governments, for example in Nigeria and in Burma, have closed down universities and sent students home as a response to activism. Sometimes, this brings activist movements to an end, but occasionally the students simply export activism to the countryside and the result is even more widespread unrest. There are many examples of violent repression of student movements, with leaders being jailed, tortured and sometimes killed. Repression frequently works in the short run, but may well sow the seeds of later unrest. In the West, repression has sometimes been used against student movements, with mixed results. Efforts in France and in West Germany to repress student movements in the 1960s resulted in the deaths of students at the hands of the policy and this increased the scope, size and militancy of the movement.[15] In the United States, repression took several forms in the 1960s. FBI and other police authorities attempted, with some success, to infiltrate students movements in order to disrupt them from the inside. Authorities also acted against demonstrations, sometimes with violent results as at Kent State and Jackson State universities in 1970.[16] The result of the killings of students by police and troops during protests against American incursions into Cambodia during the Vietnam War was national student protest which closed down several hundred universities and colleges and had a significant national impact. While there has been no tabulation of the impact of repression of student movements, it seems likely that it is just as likely to stimulate further protest as to end the demonstrations. Nonetheless, severe and sustained repression generally can bring a specific student activist movement to an end.

University authorities frequently have to respond to activist movements, since they are often aimed at campus issues and take place on campus. It is difficult to generalize about the responses of university authorities to student dissent since there is considerable variation over time and in different countries and institutions. With only a few exceptions, university authorities are seldom prepared to deal with student protest. Academic decision making processes do not move quickly and activist movements are not perceived as "normal" parts of university life. Frequently, different factions among the faculty make response difficult. Academic disciplinary procedures are often not geared to protest movements. In some instances, academic authorities involved directly with the campus situation prefer to move slowly but are pressed by govenment or other extra-campus powers to move quickly and decisively. Such prompt action against protests frequently further stimulates activism and sometimes escalated tactics to include building take-overs and other illegal actions.

In many instances, campus authorities sought to negotiate with student activists and reached accommodation with them. These negotiations tended to reduce campus violence and the destruction of property. In a few cases activism aimed at university issues resulted in considerable change. This was notably the case in West Germany, where student demands for reform yielded some results in the 1960s.[17] More frequently, students were able to achieve little in terms of lasting change in higher education procedures or policies. In the United States, for example, despite massive protests during the 1960s, there was little lasting significant change in American higher education.[18] However, more limited change has been possible as a result of student pressure on universities. In India, protests have frequently resulted in the removal of university administrators or the improvement of local conditions.[19] In the 1980s, the campaign to convince American universities to divest themselves of stocks in South Africa-related corporations yielded significant success. Thus, institutional response to protest, while difficult to predict, has sometimes obtained some of the changes demanded by students, although full success has seldom been achieved from the student viewpoint.

The response to student activism in terms of the media, government and the university has been mixed. Governmental authorities in some countries fear student politics and often react with repression. The mass media sometimes pays careful attention to activist movements and the demands of the students, while at other times student politics has not received much publicity. Media attention is, of course, greater at times of social turmoil in the society. Academic authorities also react in different ways depending on historical circumstance, external pressure and the governance processes of the university. While it is difficult to predict the response of external constituencies of student movements, there is no question that external response is a key variable in student activism.

Who Are the Activists?

Just as it is important to analyze the historical circumstances and the external reactions to student politics, it is also necessary to look at the activist leadership. This section is intended to provide a very broad portrait of activist leadership in a comparative context. While there has been some sociological research concerning activist student leadership in the United States, in several Western European nations and in India, the data is very limited and thus the general comments made here are quite tentative in nature.[20] There are also some significant variations among different nations. Nonetheless, it is useful to present a broad portrait of activist leadership.

Activist movements are almost always minority phenomena. Leadership cadres constitute a tiny minority of the student population. It is also the case that with few exceptions the entire movement remains a minority of the total campus population. Even in the most dramatic upheavals, such as at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964 or during the 1968 events in Paris, most students were not involved in demonstrations. In such major activist movements, the proportion of students involved is quite significant, but usually under half of the total. For most movements, including those which are quite successful and which receive considerable atteniton from the mass media, only a minority of the student population is directly involved. There are, in a sense, three "rings" of activist participation -- the core leadership, which is a tiny minority and is often significantly more radical than most participants, active followers who are well aware of the issues involved and willing to be involved in demonstrations, and a much larger group of students who are sympathetic to the broad goals of the movement but who are rather vague about the specific aspects and who are sporatically, if at all, directly involved. Outside of these rights are a large group of uninvolved students, some of whom may oppose the goals of the movement and many of whom are apathetic. The dynamics of students movements are not unlike those of other social movements although the specific aspects of campus life -- an age-graded population, a fairly close community, common social class backgrounds and other elements make student movements somewhat unusual.

The core of student leadership tends to be politically aware and often ideologically oriented. Student leaders are more likely than their less active compeers to be members of political organizations prior to their involvement in activism. Activist leadership is often politically involved during periods of campus quiet and in many instances, student political leaders are a part of an existing political community. Activist leadership has several general characteristics:

*Student activists tend to study in the social science and to some extent humanities fields. Sociology and political science are common. There has also been a propensity for students of mathematics to be involved in activist movements. Overall, the political attitudes and values of social science students are more to the left than students in many other areas and especially applied professional fields. There seems to be a kind of self-selection of activist students into the social sciences. The social sciences also focus on the study of society and of social problems and these questions may create a critical perspective in some students. Social science faculty members tend to have more radical views than the academic profession in general, and these critical views may also affect students.[21]

*Activist leaders tend to come from somewhat more affluent families than the general student population. University students overall come from wealthier families than the norm in virtually every nation, and activists come from the top families in terms of income and status. This factor is magnified in the Third World, where income differentials are immense. Overall, however, there is no doubt that student leaders are from more affluent families than the general student population.

*Leaders also come from families which are very well educated and in which mothers as well as fathers have a fairly high level of education. The families tend to be more urban in orientation and background, a key factor in Third World nations. In short, the families are more cosmopolitan than the norm.

*It has been argued by some that the child rearing and general attitudinal patterns of the families of activists is more liberal than the general population and that the configuration of childrearing, attitudes and backgrounds of the families of activists contributes significantly to their involvement in politics. Most of the data for such research has come from the United States and there is very little corroboration from a comparative perspective.[22]

*In the United States and Western Europe, using data from the 1960s, some scholars have argued that activist students tend to be among the best students earning very good grades in their studies.[23] The data on this matter is, however, not very extensive.

*Activist leaders often come from minority groups in the population. In Japan and Korea, the small Christian population has contributed a disproportionate number of student leaders. In France, Protestants have been involved in activism. In the United States, Jewish students have been significantly engaged in activism.[24] It may be that socially conscious and fairly affluent minorities tend to some extent to become involved in social movements.

There are many variations in the patterns of activist leadership and participation outlined here. For one thing, this description hold mainly for activists of the left -- and since left activism has predominated in most countries since World War Two this pattern of leadership has received most attention. It may not hold true for the important fundamentalist Islamic student movements in the Muslim world and may not prevail for campus-based student groups in India, where the concern is often with local issues rather than ideological questions. As noted earlier, available data is largely from the industrialized nations and relates to the era of the 1960s, a decade of abnormally high levels of activism.

The Activist Impulse

We know fairly little about the nature of activist leadership. We know even less about why students become involved in activism and what precipitates student demonstrations and movements. Indeed, analysts and officials alike are generally surprised by outbreaks of activism in the universities. Further, there are significant variations by country and historical period. Nonetheless, it is useful to look at some of the factors that may contribute to the outbreak of student activist movements.

A variety of psychological motivations have been discussed. Lewis Feuer has argued that "generational revolt" plays a key motivating role in student activism and that activist movements and that students are acting out the 'struggle of the children against the parents.'[25] Most scholars find little validity to the generational revolt theory. Others have argued that students have a propensity to 'anti-regime' attitudes because of the nature of the campus culture, youthful idealism and the like.[26] Kenneth Keniston has argued that student activists have a higher moral sense than their uninvolved compeers since they have a commitment to act on their values.[27] On the other hand, one of the few cross-national studies of student activists found that there is a complex set of attitudes and values which contributes to activism.[28] While there is considerable disagreement concerning the pscyhological motivations for student political activism, it seems clear that psychological dispositions and orientations as well as the sociological factors discussed earlier must be part of the activist impulse.

The most important factor stimulating the sort of student activism that has had a societal impact is a key political event or issue that has a broad social impact. The student movements that have had a significant impact on society have been stimulated by societal political events. In an earlier period, nationalism was key -- both in Europe in the 19th century and in the Third World during the pre-1945 colonial era. Students participated, sometimes taking a key leadership role, in large-scale social movements. In the United States, students were concerned about foreign policy issues -- against American involvement in European conflicts and about the deepening economic depression during the 1930s in the period of intense political activism on campus.[29]

In the contemporary period, broader political issues have been the main stimulants for large scale student activist movements. Issues such as nuclear war, civil rights and liberties and of course the war in Vietnam have been the main motivating forces for American student protest during the 1960s.[30] In Europe, societal politics were also the main element during the turbulent Sixties. French students reacted against the authoritarianism of the DeGaulle regime, while in West Germany, students organized an "extra-preliminary" opposition to the coalition government of the conservative Christian-Democrats and the leftist Social-Democrats.[31] In most of the other European nations where activism was a major force it was also extra-campus political issues that were the major motivating force.

In the industrialized nations, educational and campus-based issues are sometimes relevant to student activism, but such questions do not usually stimulate mass movements. In the United States, a feeling in the 1960s that the American "mass university" was not meeting student needs was evident, but there is no evidence that this discontent contributed significantly to massive student activism. Educational reform was also a minor element of the agenda of the movement. Similarly, in Western Europe, higher education reform played a role in France, West Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden, but it was not the key motivating force.

The underlying motivating factors contributing to student activism are complex. No doubt, psychological proclivities play a role. So too do economic realities. Students worry about future jobs and about their role in the upper strata of society after graduation. It is evident that, at least in the industrialized nations, major student movements have been stimulated not by campus issues but rather by broader social and political concerns. The development of activism is no doubt a product of many forces and factors.

The Impact of Activism

Despite the fact that student political activism is largely a minority phenomenon, that it is sporadic in nature and that student leaders do not reflect the rank-and-file of the student population, the impact of student movements has been immense. The following discussion will give an indication of the variations in impact without providing a comprehensive analysis. While the most dramatic effects of student activism concern the overthrow of governments (limited largely to the Third World), there are many other less volatile but nonetheless important results which deserve careful attention.

In July of 1988, the Prime Minister of Burma stepped down after twenty-six years in power. His resignation was precipitated by two months of student demonstrations. The agitation resulted in a number of deaths but did not stop.[32] About a year earlier, student protests in South Korea led to concessions by the government which resulted in elections and a significant political change. Such student induced changes have been most evident in the Third World, and this phenomenon will be discussed in the next section. However, students in industrialized nations have occasionally directly influenced politics. A few examples will illustrate the point. In 1968, French students forced President DeGaulle to flee the country for a French military base in West Germany, and brought the poltiical system to the verge of collapse.[33] A few years earlier, student demonstrations against Prime Minister Kishi in Japan forced his resignation. And in the United States, student dissent against the war in Vietnam was a key factor in influencing Lyndon Johnson not to run for a second term as President.[34] More frequently, as in the case of the "extra parliamentary opposition" in West Germany in the 1960s, student activism does not force political change but rather focuses attention on social or political problems. Thus, the direct and indirect political impact of student movements is considerable, but at the same time infrequent.

Student activists frequently serve as a social and political barometer of their societies. Through the issues that they focus on, they sometimes point to flashpoints of concern, sometimes before these issues reach a social boiling point. This may be particularly true for authoritarian societies, where free political expression is not permitted and for Third World societies, where students are among the best organized and most articulate groups in the country. Campus based organizations are frequently given more latitude than would be the case elsewhere in society and students are often more interested in social issues in any case. The concerns expressed by student organizations may well spill over to the society later.

Students have also had a considerable cultural impact. Student attitudes about cultural norms are frequently more liberal than is the case for the broader society and the trends on campus may influence broader societal norms later. In the United States, trends evident on campus later spread to the middle classes and to some extent to the society at large. For example, concerns about civil rights were expressed first in the universities in the early 1960s. The feminist movement first gained strength on campus and then spread.[35] Permissive attitudes concerning abortion, marriage and the use of drugs were first widespread among university students and then spread to the broader society. Indeed, it can be argued that one of the most important legacies of the activism of the 1960s in the United States was not political but rather cultural and attutidinal. Similar trends were evident in Western Europe. What are often seen as avant garde campus trends eventually spread beyond the universities. Frequently, but not in all cases, student activists are responsible for these trends and are most active in spreading them beyond the gates of the campus. The cultural impact of student activism is very difficult to measure, but it is nonetheless an important.

Curiously, the educational impact of student activism has, in most countries, been modest. As noted earlier, in a few countries, such as West Germany, students articulated perspectives about university reform and were able to partially ensure that their ideas were implemented in the 1960s. In France, while students did not propose specific reforms, they agitated for change in higher education and they were a key catalyst for such change. Generally, however, student activists may complain about the situation of higher education but they have few concrete ideas for change and have not seen the university as a major battleground. Thus, their impact on the academy has been limited. In the United States, there was much criticism of higher education during the 1960s, but only one set of changes were strongly influenced by the student movement -- the growth and institutionalization of women's studies and black studies programs in American universities. Student activism has frequently disrupted the normal functioning of universities and has sometimes subjected academic institutions to significant external pressure. One of the legacies of the activism of the 1960s in several Western countries was societal discontent with higher education institutions, in part engendered by public reaction against student activism. In the United States, this contributred to declines in state budgetary allocations for public higher education in some areas.

Thus, student activism has had many impacts. In a few instances, the impact has been dramatic and immediate. More often, activism has had a less direct influence. It has contributed to the development of public opinion or has raised public consciousness about politics. At times, students have precipitated actions which they did not favor, such the seizure of power by the military in South Korea or repression of dissidents in Argentina. The ideas posited by student activists concerning politics, culture and education have often gained acceptance in society later. The campus is frequently the source of avant-garde ideas which obtain a wider audience.

There is often a tendency to judge student movements on the basis of the direct impact that students have. But this is too simplistic because the impact of student activism is often less direct and less immediately visible. Students might contribute an idea which does not yield results until years later. For example, complaints by a minority of active students against in loco parentis in the 1950s and early 1960s led to the virtual abandonment of the practice a few years later. The styles in culture, attitudes and music evident on the American campus gradually spread to the rest of the youth culture and beyond. Further, as student generations mature they frequently bring some of the values and orientations learned on campus to the broader society. It is virtually impossible to quantify these less dramatic trends but they are nonetheless quite important in assessing the impact of student activism.

The Industrialized Nations and the Third World

While largely ignored in the literature, the dramatic differences between student activism in the Third World and the industrialized nations key analytic variables. Third World students have overthrown governments and have frequently had a direct political impact. This has not been the case in the industrialized nations, where students only rarely have created political change.

Third World student activism is difficult to categorize. Student involvement in nationalist movement was a key factor in many nations in the independence struggles. In Latin America, students in 1918 stimulated a major reform in higher education which has influenced the university up to the present time. Students have been instrumental in overthrowing governments in many nations in the Third World.[36] Despite their ability to precipitate political upheaval, students have never been able to take power and their efforts to have often led to governments hich have been highly unsympathetic to student goals. For example, in both Korea and Thailand, student dissent caused the downfall of regimes but the military assumed political power rather than groups favored by the students in the 1960s. In Argentina, student unrest led not to a leftist government but rather to right-wing repression of students and others. In Uruguay, student-led activism was met with massive military repression. In other cases, students, while unable to seize power for themselves were nonetheless successful in precipitating political change that was generally in a direction that they favored. In 1987, student demonstrations in South Korea forced the government to call elections and the result was a signficant move toward democracy. While student activists did not feel that the change was large enough, most Koreans saw it as highly significant. The pattern of student unrest in India and a few other Third World countries has focused on the universities themselves in an effort not only to express opposition to established policy but also to win improvement in difficult campus condtions and poor job prospects for graduates.[37] Indian student "indiscipline" has frequently resulted in campus disruption. On occasion, Indian students have also demonstrated against political officials and have sometimes forced them to resign. Thus, the spectrum of Third World student dissent is very broad. Ideologies range from the most revolutionary Marxist theories to Islamic fundamentalism. Sophisticated ideological rhetoric characterizes some student movements, while others have no discernable perspective. Some movements aim at the overthrow of the government while others are concerned with poor conditions in the dormitories.

There are many reasons why Third World students have been successful in politics, especially when compared to activist movements in the industrialized nations. While it is not possible in this essay to develop a comprehensive theoretical explanation for Third World student politics, it is worthwhile to point to some of the key factors.

> *Third World nations often lack the established political institutions and structures of the industrialized nations, and it is thus easier for any organized groups, such as the student movement, to have a direct impact on politics.

*Students have, in many cases been involved in independence movements and from the beginning of the state have been a recognized part of the political system. Thus, in contrast to the West, where activism is seen by most people to be an aberration and an illegitimate intrusion into politics, Third World students are expected to participate directly in politics and activism is seen as a legitimate part of the political system.

*Third World university students constitute a kind of incipient elite and have, in many countries, a consciousness that they are somehow special. They are members of a tiny minority who have access to postsecondary education. Their prospects for later success in careers are very good.[38] The advantages, real and imagined, accruing to those who have a university degree and the historical sense of eliteness are a powerful combination.

*The location of the major universities of the Third World contributes to the possibility of activislm. Many are located in the capital cities, and a large proportion of the student population is within easy reach of the centers of power. This simple fact of geography makes demonstrations easier to organize and gives students a sense that they are at the center of power and have easy access to it.

*Relatively few Third World nations have effective functioning democratic systems. As a result of this, and of the widespread problems of illiteracy and poor communications, students are often seen as spokespersons for a broader population. They have, in a sense, authority beyond their small numbers, and those in power often take student demonstrations and grievances seriously for this reason. In many cases, seemingly small student agitations have been effective in quickly mobilizing larger social movements or have had a surprising impact on the authorities. In a sense, Third World students act as a "conscience" of their societies.

*Because Third World students, on the average, come from higher socioeconomic groups then their compeers in industrialized nations, they have an added impact. While there are significant national differences and the situation is rapidly changing in terms of social class background as higher education expands, a substantial portion of the student population many Third World nations comes from urban elite backgrounds and they have, through their families, direct access to powerful segments of society.

These factors are a partial explanation for the relative effectiveness of student activist movements in the Third World in the past several decades. While students in the industrialized nations, particularly during the 1960s, had an impact on their societies, their role pales into insignificance when compared to the Third World student movements. Further, Third World students have continued to be a force -- they did not disappear at the end of the decade of the 1960s.

Conclusion

Student political activism is a multifaceted phenonmenon. There are many variations because of historical circumstance, level of socio-political development, and political and educational systems. Student movements are difficult to predict. Further, effective movements depend on external circumstances for their success -- on the media and on acceptance by key social groups of the legitimacy of the activist movement. Student movements, by themselves, are never powerful enough to overturn a government. The movement depends on its idea and on the perception of legitimacy that it manages to create.

Student movements seem to go through cycles. For the past decade, in most industrialized nations, student movements have been neither active nor successful. In some Third World nations, activism has continued although overall the trend has been toward quietude. In many ways, it is just as important to study student politics when it is at a low ebb as it is during a phase of militancy. Both phases can provide insights into the nature of student politics and perhaps into broader political realities.

Academic institutions are a key part of the activist equation. Universities, through their policies and orientations, affect activist movements. They are in turn often dramatically affected by activism. Student movements may disrupt academic life or may bring the wrath of political authorities on the campus. Activism may stimulate educational reforms of various kinds. Thus, it is very important for academic authorities to fully understand the nature and causes of student politics.

Student activism may be sporadic, ill-organized and sometimes frustrating for those in authority who must deal with it. Students activists frequently ignore the lessons and traditions of student movements and thus fail to achieve as much success as possible. Few look at students activism from a comparative perspective, and thus fail to obtain as comprehensive an overview as possible. This essay is an effort to provide the kind of broad multifaceted framework that is necessary for a full understanding of a force which is of major importance, not only for higher education but in many countries for politics and society.

Notes

1. Edith H. Altbach, "Vanguard of Revolt: Students and Politics in Central Europe, 1815-1848," in *Students in Revolt*, ed. S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach. (Boston: Beacon, 1969), pp. 451-474.
2. Michael S. Steinberg, *Sabers and Brown Shirts: The German Students' Path to National Socialism, 1918-1935*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977). See also Geoffrey Giles, *Students and National Socialism in Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).
3. See S. M. Lipset, "University Students and Politics in Underdeveloped Nations," *Comparative Education Review*, 10 (June, 1966): 132-162.
4. Stephen A. Douglas and Harsja Bachtiar, "Indonesian Students: The Generation of 1966" in *The Student Revolution*, ed. P. G. Altbach (Bombay: Lalvani, 1970), pp. 156-160.
5. Chow Tse-tung, *The May Fourth Movement* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960). See also John Israel, *Student Nationalism in China, 1927-1937*, (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966).
6. For an historical overview of the Asian case, see Philip G. Altbach, "Student Movements in Historical Perspective: The Asian Case," *Youth and Society* 1 (March, 1970): 333-357.
7. Richard J. Walter, *Student Politics in Argentina: The University Reform and Its Effects, 1918-1964* (New York: Basic Books, 1966).
8. See Robert Cohen, "Revolt of the Depression Generation: America's First Mass Student Protest Movement," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1988).
9. Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Centry to the Present* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
10. Japan, which has had a strong tradition of student political activism, is a partial exception to this generalization. Japanese higher education at the undergraduate level, is not very competitive and there is little pressure to pass difficult examinations. This is in sharp contrast to the highly competitive situation in secondary education.
11. In post-Independence India, much student activism has been confined to campus-based issues, such as the improvement of student living conditions, and the impact of such "indiscipline", as it is called in India, seldom extends beyond the university. See S. H. Rudolph and L. I. Rudolph, *Education and Politics in India: Studies in*

Organization, Society and Politics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972).

12. Todd Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).
13. See Ronald Fraser, 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt (New York: Pantheon, 1988).
14. Donald K. Emmerson, ed., Students and Politics in Developing Nations (New York: Praeger, 1968).
15. Ronald Fraser, op. cit., pp. 203-230, 261-280.
16. James A. Michener, Kent State: What Happened and Why (New York: Random House, 1971).
17. Wolfgang Nitch, et al., Hochschule in der Demokratie (Berlin: Luchterhand, 1965).
18. Alexander W. Astin, et al., The Power of Protest (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).
19. Philip G. Altbach, ed., Turmoil and Transition: Higher Education and Student Politics in India (New York: Basic Books, 1968).
20. For the United States, see James L. Wood, The Sources of American Student Activism (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974) for an overview of research on the sociological and psychological origins of activists. For India, see Jacob Aikara, Ideological Orientation of Student Activism (Poona: Dastane Ramchandra, 1977). See also Ross Prizzia and Narong Sinsawasdi, Thailand: Student Activism and Political Change (Bangkok: D. K. Book House, 1974) and Arthur Liebman, Kenneth N. Walker and Myron Glazer, Latin American University Students: A Six Nation Study (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972).
21. S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach, "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States," Comparative Education Review 10 (June, 1966), pp. 320-349.
22. See Kenneth Keniston, Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1968) and Kenneth Keniston, Youth and Dissent (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971) for an elaboration of this point of view.
23. Robert Liebert, Radical and Militant Youth: A Psychoanalytic Inquiry (New York: Praeger, 1971).
24. Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, Roots of Radicalism: Jews, Christians and the New Left (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).
25. Lewis Feuer, The Conflict of Generation: The Character and Significance of Student Movements (New York: Basic Books, 1969).

26. See Edward Shils, "Dreams of Plentitude, Nightmares of Scarcity," in Students in Revolt, ed., S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), pp. 1-33.
27. Kenneth Keniston, op. cit.
28. Otto Klineberg, Marisa Zavalloni, Christaine Louis-Guerin and Jeanne Ben-Brika, Students, Values and Politics: A Cross-Cultural Comparison (New York: Free Press, 1979).
29. Robert Cohen, op. cit. See also Philip G. Altbach, Student Politics in America (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), pp. 57-104.
30. James Miller, Democracy Is In the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987). See also Maurice Isserman, If I Had a Hammer...The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left (New York: Basic Books, 1987).
31. Ronald Fraser, op. cit.
32. B. Lintner, "Burma: The Wrath of the Children," Far Eastern Economic Review (July 21, 1988): 18-19.
33. Alain Schnapp and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, The French Student Uprising: An Analysitical Documentary (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971).
34. Todd Gitlin, op. cit.
35. Sara Evans, Personal Politics (New York: Knopf, 1979).
36. Students contributed to significant political upheaval in the following countries, among others: Argentina, Uruguay, Peru, Bolivia, Thailand, South Korea, Iran, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Burma, Turkey, Nigeria, Liberia, Ghana and Nicaragua. Students did not necessarily topple regimes in these countries, but their actions had significant political results.
37. N. Jayaram, "Sadhus No Longer: Recent Trends in Indian Student Activism," Higher Education 8 (November, 1979): 683-700.
38. Joel Barkan, An African Dilemma: University Students, Development, and Politics in Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda (Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1975).

UNIVERSITY REFORM

Philip G. Altbach

The reform of universities is a matter of importance and controversy throughout the world. As societies have placed increased demands on postsecondary educational institutions, these institutions have been called on to change to accommodate these new functions. Historically, universities have had to adapt to new functions and roles.[1] While it is true that academic institutions are slow to change and are notably conservative entities, they have been transformed over the centuries. The modern university has historical links to the its medieval antecedents and academic traditions are important in the historical memory, as well as in the ceremonies of academic institutions, but there has been an immense amount of institutional redefinition, expansion and change over time. The modern multiversity shares common traditions with the medieval University of Paris, but it is a vastly expanded and quite different institution.[2] This essay focuses on some of the elements of change in higher education in an effort to look at the sources and nature of reform in the university.

Reform is one of the most controversial elements in higher education and therefore has attracted much attention, both within the academic community and outside.[3] Reform is frequently the focus of governmental and public attention on higher education because of demands for universities to serve new needs that require changes in the structures and operations of the universities. In today's struggle for accountability--the desire for public authority to obtain control over higher education, reform is frequently one of the means of asserting this control and ensuring that academic institutions serve what is seen as the public good.[4] At the same time, those within the universities, and particularly the senior academic staff, often see reform as a threat, not only to established academic values, but also to the concept of academic autonomy. [5] Reform is without question a matter of contestation and controversy in the university.

It is difficult enough to design and implement higher education reform. It is even more problematical to institutionalize it.[6] We are concerned here with discussing some of the reasons that university reform is initiated, the factors that contribute to it, and also elements of the process of reform implementation and institutionalization. These processes are extraordinarily complex.

We define reform in a simple and fairly encompassing way--as planned change in higher education.[7] The term reform usually applies to change of a basic structural, organizational or curricular nature: smaller alterations with more modest goals and implications are more properly labeled innovations. This definition includes a great many of the alterations that have taken place in higher education--changes from basic alterations in academic organization to much smaller reform in the curriculum. Many post World World War Two developments in higher education did not stem from purposeful reform or planned change but from accretion--the adding on functions, institutes, curricula without a clearly articulated plan--or simply from expansion. In the United States, for example, higher education has often developed without careful planning and often without regard for the long-term implications of change. We are concerned here with the process of planned change in order to understand how academic institutions adapt to new circumstances and challenge

Difficulties of Reform

The design and implementation of reform is difficult in any academic setting. There are a number of factors which contribute to this situation. The historical memory of academic institutions is universally a conservative force. Established patterns of organization are difficult to break since they have been established for many years--sometimes for centuries. Curricular structures are often deeply entrenched and difficult to change. The historical tradition of the autonomy both of the professoriate and of the academic institution itself makes rapid change difficult. As Edward Shils has pointed out, the historical ethos of the university makes for a strong sense of tradition and puts slows change.[8] Shils also argues that this ethos puts a break on sometimes ill-advised proposals for change which might not be in the long term best interest of the institution. Institutional memory and the resulting conservatism that it engenders may sometimes be an advantage. An example of the impact of the historical memory of universities is the difficulty of establishing research as a key function of higher education in the 19th century, first in Germany and then in the United States and other countries.[9] Academic institutions were traditionally oriented toward the transmission of established knowledge and not the creation of new knowledge through research. They were particularly unfamiliar with working with the "practical" problems of rapidly industrializing societies. It was only after considerable struggle that established academic institutions accepted the role of research and knowledge creation.

The organizational structure of the university also places limits rapid reform.[10] Academic institutions have been characterized as organized anarchies in which decision making is very difficult because of the complex structure of committees and the relative autonomy of all of the elements of the system, and particularly of the individual professors. Universities are, at the same time, large bureaucratic institutions which have many of the characteristics of the medieval guild. This makes organizational control very difficult.[11]

The professoriate is at the heart of any academic institution and it has generally been slow to accept reform.[12] The academic staff dominates the structures of the university.

This ensures that the typical committee structures of academe move slowly and deliberately. There is generally an emphasis on consensus and a desire to ensure that all elements of the academic community are heard and that none are harmed in any institutional change. Senior faculty are especially reluctant to approve changes that will result in a weakening of their power or authority, particularly since they have traditionally dominated the university. The faculty in general feels very strongly about the importance of university autonomy--the ability of the university to function and to set policy without outside interference--and reform proposals are often seen as a threat to autonomy.

Unlike virtually all other complex organizations, the university has no clearly delineated line of bureaucratic authority. Although tables of organization provide a delineation of authority, the process of decision making is complex. Further, in practice, those with titular authority are often unable to exercise it without the consensus of the academic community. Those occupying top administrative positions most often come from the professoriate and share many of the values of the professoriate. Even where they are able to exercise authority, they are reluctant to do so.

Universities in some ways are highly democratic institutions. Power stems from the bottom of the institution -- from the academic staff and especially from the senior professors. The academic staff, in most countries, has the protection of a tenure system which provides both security of employment and guarantees of free expression of ideas, particularly on academic matters. There is general recognition of the key role of the professoriate in all decision making and the governance structures of the institution are set up to reflect the need for participation and consensus. The tradition of participation in academic governance is deeply ingrained in the academic system and has implications for the nature and implementation of change and reform.

The tradition of academic autonomy also plays a role in the reform process.[13] Autonomy implies that individual academic staff have the right to determine their own intellectual and research interests and to a considerable degree their content and focus of their teaching as well. It also implies that the the university should have autonomy to determine its goals, means of operation and of course structure of degree programs and qualifications for admission and graduation. Full autonomy means that universities are self-governing institutions. Of course, academic institutions have never been fully autonomous, particularly since funds are generally provided by public sources and inevitably those who provide funds have some say in determining the orientation of the institution. Further, in recent years, debates concerning the appropriate balance between autonomy and accountability--how much those providing funds should control or influence academic institutions -- have had the result of gradually limiting traditional institutional autonomy.[14] Nonetheless, the traditional concept of autonomy has limited the impact of external forces on the internal decision making of the university and thus has slowed the process of externally-generated reform.

Funding, not surprisingly, has been a key factor in discussions of university reform. Many reforms and innovations require funds and these funds are often unavailable, thus limiting the scope or implementation of reform. Curricular reforms may require additional academic staff of equipment. Large reforms, such as altering the focus of an academic institution or building new universities, require very substantial infusions of resources. Governments, when made aware of the scope of the funds required, may back away from the proposed reforms. In addition, the "hidden cost" of reform is often considerable -- costs resulting from disruptions in university procedures, confusion, delays and the like. Reforms are often proposed without regard for the full cost involved,, and when the budgetary implications are considered, idealistic and innovative programs may be scaled down considerably or even shelved. Without question, financial factors weigh heavily in the reform process.

Substantial change is almost always controversial, and controversy breeds resistance, debate and, in academe, often compromise. In addition to faculty opposition to aspects of a reform and government resistance to high costs, the reforms themselves may be politically inexpedient. Ministries of Education, for example, may fear that their power is being eroded by reforms permitting increased local control. Government officials may be reluctant to allow substantial student participation in academic governance because of possible radicalism among student representatives. Administrators (or more often faculty members) may feel that they would lose power or prerogatives in a reform program. Government officials may feel that proposed reforms may not guarantee sufficient accountability. The public, on rare occasions, may become involved in academic issues when, for example, access to higher education may be restricted.

The Need for University Reform

Despite the difficulties outlined above, the need for university reform is considerable, stimulating both academic and governmental authorities to seek to design and implement reforms. The basic fact of the post-war period internationally has been dramatic expansion of higher education. Not only have enrollments grown significantly, in some countries doubling each decade, but academic institutions have also expanded their functions as well. They have added new specializations and disciplines, have increased emphasis on research and publication, have added a range of public service functions, and have developed administrative structures to serve these new roles.

Expansion has increased the complexity of academic institutions.[15] The curriculum has become more varied. Expansion of the research function and the growth of science has added a variety of interdisciplinary centers and institutes which must be accommodated in the academic structure.[16] The accommodation of ever larger numbers of students both on individual university campuses and in the higher education system as a whole has created problems of adjustment and change. Universities which traditionally had a simple administrative structure of departments and schools now must add new divisions.[17] Academic departments with thirty or more staff members require more complex management. Increasing student numbers require services which are ever more complex and often expensive, from athletic facilities to dormitories to psychological and vocational counseling. As student numbers have expanded, the traditionally elite student population has come to include a wider cross section of the population and this has also created strains on traditional academic structures.

Entirely new fields such as biotechnology and computer science have emerged as important parts of the academic curriculum and key areas for research. Such fields have been incorporated into the academic structure. All of these factors have immensely increased the size, budget and complexity of academic institutions. This in turn has necessitated the expansion of administrative structures and personnel to deal with expansion. In many countries, an "administrative estate" has emerged that is now an important part of the academic decision making apparatus. While top administrators come from the ranks of the professoriate, a large and growing number of administrative cadres have no direct relation to the traditional academic profession.

In part due to the strains created by these factors, there have been unprecedented demands by elements outside of the universities for change and reform. During the 1960s, student activists were a powerful force criticizing the universities and demanding change. In West Germany, radical students proposed a series of dramatic reforms that were adopted in several of the German states.[18] In other countries, including the United States, students demanded reform without clearly articulating specific changes.[19] Academic affairs became the subject of public debate as the crisis in the universities became more apparent and as academic institutions grew in importance. Perhaps most important, governments began to take a direct and sometimes intense interest in higher education as universities consumed ever larger amounts of public money and as academic institutions assumed an ever more central place in the economies of both postindustrial societies and the developing nations of the Third World. Expansion led to a range of other 'crises' in higher education that called for attention. Some of the proposed solutions to these problems led to proposals for reform.

The Saga of Reform[20]

It is important to understand how universities have changed over time in order to sense what one might call the saga of change and reform. It is, of course, important to note that much change in higher education occurs without specific plan, as a process of accretion of the simple adding on of functions or the unplanned consequences of many specific academic and administrative decisions. Often, these acts have unanticipated consequences which may have major institutional implications. We are, however, mainly concerned with changes that result from a conscious process of planning and decision making.

There have been several key periods of reform in the recent past and while it is not possible to fully discuss them here, it is important to mention them since these periods have helped to shape the contemporary university. The American university has been shaped by two key developments; the rise of the "land grant" idea after the Civil War and the adoption of the German research concept toward the end of the 19th century.[21] Both of these developments were the result of a series of reforms which transformed American higher education and which shaped the modern American university -- an institutional model that has had an important impact internationally in the 20th century.[22] It is important to note that these two key reforms in the United States were undertaken as the result of external, mainly societal, pressure and there was some resistance from key segments of the academic community. Indeed, the German research impact was felt first in new universities established with the new model in mind--institutions such as Johns Hopkins and Chicago--rather than at Harvard, which at first resisted the change.[23]

The implanting of Western universities in the non-Western world is also one of the most significant academic developments of the past two centuries. Both in the colonized areas and in noncolonized nations such as Thailand and Japan, Western academic models were adopted and later successfully implanted and adapted to serve local needs.[24] In noncolonized nations particularly, this process involved planning and consideration of the consequences of different academic models and practices.

These are a few examples of historical academic development and reform. The establishment of new universities is, in many ways, one of the most interesting examples of reform since the new institutions are most often designed to differ from established universities and are intended to fulfill new needs.[25] Indeed, the difficulties of reforming older institutions frequently makes the development of entirely new ones the only effective means of meeting new demands. It is also significant that, with very few exceptions, the new institutions do not differ dramatically from established universities. They are designed to serve new functions and to incorporate new ideas but the basic ethos and models reflect established academic norms. The establishment of the Massachusetts Institute of

Technology in the United States and of the Tsukuba University in Japan are examples of this trend.

A very important part of the saga or reform is the process of institutionalization. This process involves the embedding of the reform, or perhaps of the new institution, into the academic fabric. It is not enough to design a new program, department or even institution. It is necessary to ensure that the reform is accepted into the academic system and that it is carefully institutionalized into the system. Institutionalization may necessitate continuing resources provided to support the reform. It often requires ensuring that the reform is linked carefully to related academic programs or institutions. Reforms must be in time accepted by the academic community. For example, the West German efforts to include students as an almost equal part of the governance process in the universities were never accepted by the senior academic staff. This element of the 1960s German reforms was opposed and eventually partly eliminated through institutional opposition and legal challenges.[26]

Institutionalization is very often insufficiently considered in the process of change and reform. Funds may be allocated for the initial reform process and implementation but not for any follow-up process of institutionalization. Reforms that challenge established academic practice are particularly prone to later compromise and opposition from powerful segments of the academic community that were never enthusiastic. Reforms must mesh with the rest of the system and this often requires careful attention as the saga of reform unfolds over time.

Each reform has, in a sense, its own saga. The process of development, implementation and institutionalization will differ from country to country and from institution to institution. While it is possible to discuss common causes for reform and to use the literature, for example, of organizational theory and complex organizations to help understand the process of reform, it must kept in mind that each reform is played out with a considerable influence from specific local circumstances. Thus, the planning of reforms must take carefully into account the specific circumstances involved. The analysis of reforms must also take into account the local saga as well as broader factors.

The Impetus for Reform

The impetus for reform comes from many sources but, overall, is either from external forces or from within the university. As noted earlier, in the postwar period, the major underlying factor impelling reform has been the implications of expansion--of enrollments as well as of the mission of the university. However, it is necessary to look more specifically at particular reform efforts. While there has been no systematic survey of reforms worldwide, it seems likely that the majority of reforms have stemmed from external stimulus. As Kitamura and Cummings have pointed out, the "big bang" has had the largest reform impact.[27] They argue that academic crises stimulated external authorities to focus attention on the universities and to insist that something be done to "solve" the crisis. Their analysis is based on the Japanese case, in which severe academic crises during the 1960s stimulated many reform inquiries and numerous plans, but in the end relatively little reform. They point out that the innate conservatism of the institutions and the cumbersome governance process made internal reform very difficult. The major reforms that have been proposed in the past several decades are almost exclusively the result of external pressures of various kinds. Perhaps the world's most thoroughgoing university system reform, Sweden's U68 plan, was designed and implemented by external forces. [28] The academic community, in general, opposed it throughout the process. In the United States, the various crises of the 1960s placed great external pressure on the universities for change, but in few instances did governmental authorities step in to dictate solutions. Perhaps as a result, relatively few significant reforms were implemented.

Reforms can also be designed and implemented through internal initiative. Indeed, it can be argued that internally developed reforms have the best likelihood of success. Internal reforms tend not to alter the basic structure of the university but rather to address more limited problems in the universities. They seldom alter the power arrangements or the basic governance of the university. A successful example of such a reform effort that has had national implications in the United States was the reinvigoration of the liberal arts curriculum that took place in the 1980s.[29] The faculty felt that the "core" of the university had been lost in the loosening of academic requirements during the 1960s and then the increased vocationalism of the 1970s. Professors in the traditional liberal arts field were also worried about the role of these fields and about their own enrollments. This powerful combination of circumstances combined to create a consensus within the academic community for a significant reform in the undergraduate curriculum. It is significant that the curricular reform effort in the United States did not require significant new funding, indicating that all academic change does not necessarily require infusions of money.

Students have an indirect and important role in stimulating reform and change in higher education. Only rarely do students demand specific changes and most academic systems are unwilling to involve students directly in the process of reform.[30] It is also fair to say that the academic community is reluctant to listen to student demands. In only a few instances, such as in West Germany in the 1960s, have students come up with specific plans for reform. More often, as has been the case in France first in 1968 and on several occasions later, students articulated general discontent with the general academic situation and sometimes with specific plans, and through demonstrations, focused attention on their concerns and were, in some cases, able either to ensure that an unpopular policy was not implemented or that their broader demands were taken seriously by governmental or academic authorities. In the United States, student discontent with the traditional "in loco parentis" system which stipulated many academic rules governing student extracurricular life resulted in major changes and the basic elimination of academic authority over the non-academic lives of students.[31] In this instance, student demands coincided with the orientation of the faculty toward research and a willingness of the faculty to give up authority of student lives. Thus, the student role in stimulating reform can be quite significant but students are not often directly involved directly in designing and implementing the reforms. Students can, however, sometimes exert a kind of veto on reforms. In France, for example, student demonstrations forced the government to give up planned changes in entrance requirements for French universities in the 1980s. Unpopular changes in specific universities may cause students to choose other institutions. As has been noted, student choices of major fields has significant implications for institutional policy and the allocation of resources.While seldom direct, students play a very important role in the process and particularly in the implemention and success of reforms.

The Process of Reform

In a decentralized academic system like that of the United States, changes may be proposed in a general way at the national level but must be implemented at the state or local levels. Federal funding for specific projects helps, of course, but here, too, policy implementation occurs at lower levels. In highly centralized systems such as Japan, Italy, or Sweden, the national government has a key role in determining the nature of reforms and in defining the means of implementation, although local cooperation is required. In federal systems, like West Germany, India, Canada and the United States, state governments have the primary governmental role. The nature of the political system, the tradition of relationships between higher education and government, and the formal lines of authority and governance between higher education and public control all play a role in the reform process.

Differences in academic organization also influence the nature of the reform process. In academic systems that have a strong administrative apparatus, as is typical in the United States and increasingly the case in other countries, the administrative hierarchy plays a role that can stimulate reform. The academic community, as noted earlier, is generally most important, even in highly centralized systems such as in Eastern Europe.In short, the locus of power in the academic system is a key element in the reform process.

The first step in the reform process is identifying problems requiring change. Some problems, such as severe overcrowding or the production of graduates in fields where there are no jobs, are self-defining but often not amenable to reform. Others, such as estimating future enrollment trends from population projections, determining the proportion of the age groups expected to demand higher education, and adjusting the universities to meet these expected trends, are more subtle and take time. A dramatic event such as a mass student demonstration, a faculty strike or a fiscal crisis, will identify a problem that may have gone unsolved for years. In other cases, an official commission or government inquiry may identify problems and suggest solutions. In Britain, for example, the Robbins Commission outlined the shape of British higher education expansion and in Sweden the U68 Commission proposed the nature a significant reform of the universities.[32] In both of these cases, the bulk of the proposals were implemented.

Once problems are identified, mechanisms must be set up to find workable solutions. One of the most common means of arriving at solutions in academe is the ubiquitous committee system. Often an ad hoc committee is set up to study a problem and recommend solutions. While such committees may may be internal to the university, they often include government officials and private citizens. They can range from modest informal arrangements to well-funded full-scale efforts with research staff.. Deliberations are often time consuming and in many instances the impetus for change is considerably blunted by the time the report is made.

Committees, although probably the most common means for generating reform proposals, are not the only means available. Charismatic leaders occasionally proposed changes that are influential. Wilhelm von Humboldt in Germany, Robert M. Hutchins in the United States and Arinori Mori in Japan come to mind as visionary reformers whose proposals were carefully considered by the universities. In the contemporary period, there have been few, if any, visionary leaders who have individually had such an important influence on higher education. And no philosophers of the stature of Ortega y Gasset or John Henry Newman are evident in the post World War Two era.[33] Nonetheless, it is possible for individuals to have an important role in shaping higher education policy. Clark Kerr in the United States, Eric Ashby in Britain (and the Commonwealth) and Lord Robbins in England have all helped to shape contemporary higher education.

Once a reform has been determined, the next and in many ways the most difficult part of the process is that of implementation. Implementation can be accomplished by committee, administrative fiat or by other means. It is difficult to generalize about the implementation process because it varies so greatly and is handled at a number of different levels by the academic system. It is at the level of implementation that compromises often transform what is a clear mandate for reform into a result that may be far removed from the one envisaged by the planners or reformers. Faculty, administrators, and sometimes students are all involved in the implementation process. Local political forces may also have an impact. Fiscal issues may play a role too.

The process of reform involved a variety of steps and is almost inevitably complex and subject to compromise. University reform always takes more time that was anticipated and if often more expensive than envisaged. The process may, indeed,be so exhausting that the reformers give up. The fact that so many levels of decision making are involved means that the possibility for compromise and delay is enhanced. Indeed, it is surprising that any reform at all takes place given the obstacles of the process.

Contemporary Reform Directions

While it is not possible to consider the vast array of reforms that have been proposed and implemented in the past several decades, it is worthwhile to point to a small number of the most interesting changes that are evident in higher education in order to illustrate some of the key directions of contemporary reforms.[34] While universities have not undergone the basic structural changes that characterized the latter 19th century in the United States and in Germany, the past several decades have been quite active in terms of reforms. The 1960s were a period in which universities adjusted to the immense expansion that took place in that period in the industrialized nations and to the challenges of the student protests of that period.[35] Universities became more complex institutions as they dealt with the consequences of expansion. The social class base of the student population widened as numbers grew.

The 1970s saw other challenges. Economic problems in society created fiscal constraint. The management of expansion became the management of decline, at least in the industrialized nations as enrollments stagnated and fiscal resources declined. Student vocationalism created new demands on the curriculum and stimulated some reallocation of academic resources. [36] As governments ever more carefully scrutinized their budgets, there were increased demands for accountability--the idea that universities should account for the expenditure of funds and measure their "outputs." Universities also moved to strengthen their ties with industry and to relate the curriculum more to the vocational needs of students.

Trends in the Sixties

The following trends in reform were evident in the industrialized nations during the 1960s. Most of these resulted in specific academic changes that have had lasting implications for the contemporary university.

New University Structures In order to deal with enrollment expansion and with the growth of functions of higher education, many new institutions were established. Some of these were based on different functional and organizational models. In West

Germany, the Gesamthochschule (comprehensive university) was intended to provide a more vocational focus to higher education and to link academic institutions to industry.[37] In Britain, the polytechnics were expanded and upgraded and the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) was established to provide oversight to these initiatives. The Open University in Britain provided new opportunities for higher education to nontraditional students.[38] In Latin America, private sector higher education expanded rapidly and pioneered management and technological education.[39] Many countries found that it was easier to establish entirely new institutions rather than reform existing universities.

Interdisciplinarity. Traditional academic disciplines have been considered stumbling blocks to the advancement of knowledge in a period of rapid technological change and scientific growth. Criticism has focused on the organization of universities into traditional and often conservative departments. The "chair" system, prevalent in the established German and Japanese universities, as well as in Eastern Europe, came in for special criticism. In order to break down the walls of the traditional disciplines and encourage interdisciplinary work, a variety institutes and centers were established. In France, the Faure reform measures established the UERs (unites d'enseignement et de recherche-units of research and teaching) which set up specifically interdisciplinary units as the basic building blocks of the new institutions.[40] Throughout Europe interdisciplinarity was one of the important foci of the reforms of the 1960s. It was, although in a more muted way, an emphasis in the United States as well. The American academic system was better able to accommodate interdisciplinary initiatives through its established structures, so structural reforms were not usually necessary. Interdisciplinary approaches remain important, reflecting the rapidly changing nature of scientific knowledge.

Accountability and Administrative Efficiency. Accountability subsumes a variety of concerns for making higher education programs more understandable and often more controllable by public authorities. As universities have expanded, have taken on more functions, and in general have become key societal institutions, governments have demanded increased knowledge of what occurs in higher education institutions and have often demanded control over basic directions. A significant part of the demand for accountability is, of course, the very significant public expenditures for higher education in all countries. Traditionally counterposed to accountability is the idea of university autonomy, the ability of the university to control its goals, policies, structures of governance and budget. Accountability does not necessarily mean centralization, but in most cases it has resulted in increased government involvement in academic affairs, since accountability for funds almost inevitably means accountability for programs as well.

There is little question that accountability has dramatically increased throughout the world, very often at the expense of autonomy. The 1989 decision by the British government to abolish the University Grants Committee (UGC), traditionally the guardian of autonomy in favor of a University Funding Council that will be directly responsibility to government is a serious blow to the previously highly autonomous British universities.

Accountability is not seen by the university community as a reform but rather as an unjustified interference in traditional academic autonomy and as a danger to the long term-term effectiveness of higher education. Yet, it is one of the major pressures for change. The means of accountability differ from country to country, but generally involve the use of sophisticated data-retrieval techniques to keep track of expenditures and to measure outcomes, the development of institutional research as a means of understanding the actual performance of academic programs and the the linking of academic goals and programs to the funds provided to them as a means of measuring "productivity" in fiscal terms. These ideas are controversial in the higher education community, but nevertheless are key elements of governmentally inspired efforts to change higher education.

Coupled with the move to accountability are measures to improve administrative efficiency. While such measures are not usually viewed in the same vein as curricular reform of student participation, efforts to improve administrative efficiency are one of the important currents in higher education. These efforts include the application of modern management techniques to higher education, better coordination of the administrative structures with traditional faculty governance mechanisms, and in some countries combining individual academic institutions into larger and more centralized academic systems. At the same time, there have been efforts to break down the size of megaversities (such as the University of Paris) into smaller component units. While seldom discussed in the literature on reform, innovations in management and administration very often have implications for the broader functioning of academic systems. These efforts started in the 1960s and have continued as one of the major trends in academic change.

Democratization and Participation.. The 1960s brought widespread protest against the academic aristocracy--the academic "Mandarins" or full professors, particularly in Europe and Japan, who have traditionally dominated the universities. The roots of the revolt against the academic aristocracy lay, in part, in the expansion of higher education, which created a group of powerless academic staff between the professors and the students. Students and junior academic staff demanded participation in governance and as a result of protest demonstrations and governmental action, several European university systems were reformed to include participation from both students and junior academics. In West Germany, the concept of dritteliparitat was introduced which provided one-third of the votes in key academic decision making to students, junior staff and senior professors respectively.[41] This reform was strongly opposed by the professors, who succeeded after a long struggle in the courts to curtail it. Students, at first enthusiastic, became frustrated with time-consuming academic procedures. In both West Germany and France, student participation in elections declined. While students retain a role in governance in many Western European nations, "student power" has not become commonplace in Europe. Many of the dramatic initiatives started in the 1960s have either proved unsuccessful and have been abandoned or have been limited or abolished through opposition from the senior faculty. The professoriate, in many ways, was under attack during the 1960s and the "participation movement" was one element. While it is true that the absolute power of the "academic Mandarins" was significantly weakened as a result of the reforms of the 1960s, the basic structure of the university was not changed.

Increased Responsiveness of the University to Society. In general, academic systems and individual universities have moved closer to their societies in terms of being cognizant of societal needs and attempting to work with social institutions to meet them. In the 1960s, this trend was expressed in part by the university's involvement with the political struggles of the period. More recently, universities have moved to better integrate themselves with economic structures and institutions. The curriculum has been in part vocationalized and new applied and socially and technologically applied areas have been added to the curriculum. In the 1970s and 1980s, direct links between the economy and the universities have been dramatically strengthened through collaborative research projects, joint centers on campus, increased consulting and the like in many countries. These links and programs, often ignored in the literature on university reform, constitute some of the most important and probably long lasting developments in higher education.

The Seventies and Beyond

The most dramatic reforms in recent decades took place during the tumultuous decade of the 1960s, when many academic systems were seriously disrupted by student activism and significant governmental involvement in academic affairs. Some of the results of this ferment have been mentioned here. The 1970s and 1980s have seen less dramatic and disruptive academic change, but reform continues and some of the trends are worth noting in terms of current academic realities and future directions.

Without question, one of the most important trends worldwide in higher education are the greatly increased links between the university and industry.[42] Close ties in research have been developed, with industrial firms often funding university-based research laboratories in return for access to the result of research produced in these labs. Direct involvement, sometimes through science-based industrial parks located near university campuses, of academic institutions with industrial firms is increasing rapidly. This involvement is particularly strong in high-tech areas such as information technology and biotechnology, areas in which scientific development has been very rapid. These developments have been questioned by some who worry about the role of basic research in a system focusing on applied work and about academic autonomy when industrial firms are directly involved on campus and are, at a significant degree, focusing research directions through their funding priorities.

There have also been some significant development in curricular reform. These developments are somewhat contradictory in nature. In the 1970s, throughout the the world, there was a great stress on "vocationalizing the university curriculum." This resulted in a significant broadening of the traditional academic curriculum in many countries. Trends started in such countries as Sweden and the German Democratic Republic in the 1960s were expanded dramatically. Universities expanded their offerings in new applied high-tech fields such as computer science. Many established programs for management training and other applied areas. It is fair to say that much of the academic development in recent years has been in a technological direction and that this development will have longlasting implications for universities in the coming period. The change to a more technologically oriented curriculum has been accompanied by expanding laboratory and other facilities in these areas and of course hiring academic staff capable of teaching and doing research in them.

There has been a somewhat opposing curricular reform as well. Visible particularly in the United States, there has been a concern with the traditional liberal arts curriculum. The faculty was concerned what the core of the undergraduate curriculum was vitiated by the unrest of the 1960s and the vocationalism of the 1970s. Proposals were made to restore the common core of the liberal arts curriculum, and after considerable debate curricular reforms were implemented at many universities. There have been similar concerns in Japan, but it is not clear that this is a worldwide reform trend.

In many developing countries, and particularly in the newly industriaizing nations of East and Southeast Asia, there has been a strong commitment to strengthen the research orientation of the universities. There has been considerable investment in universities in order to upgrade research capacities and new policies put into place that has encouraged academic staff to engage in research. Most countries are convinced that the universities are a necessary participant in the development process and that academic research has a long term utility in technological development and in training the high quality personnel needed for this development. Thus, research, and particularly applied research that is relevant for technological development is a priority in universities worldwide. There is a kind of "convergence" of academic institutions in many countries around a set of common themes and developments. A slow strengthening of an international academic culture is taking place.

In the industrialized nations, the 1980s has seen an effort to consolidate the gains made in the 1960s in terms of institutional reforms and changes. This period has been one of reduced financial resources in almost all industrialized nations, and thus reform initiatives have been constrained for monetary reasons. The academic community also did not react entirely favorably to the reforms of the 1960s, and is considerable resistance to further change. In Britain, which was not significantly affected by the unrest of the 1960s, some of the most significant structural changes in higher education are taking place. Despite the complete opposition of the academic community, the Thatcher government has instituted key changes in the relationship between government and the universities, most notably the abolition of the University Grants Committee. The government has also legislated the abolition of the traditional tenure system and has altered the pattern of student funding. These are thoroughgoing reforms that will have a highly significant effect on the future of British higher education.

Future Directions

Reform and change are a important part of contemporary higher education. In an environment of rapid technological change and increased demands on higher education for closer involvement with the broader society, change in higher education is both inevitable and necessary. The process of planned change and reform will continue to be an integral part of academic life. The basic structures of higher education is unlikely to be dramatically altered -- reforms will be part of established academic structures. Countries have recognized that the establishment of a large number of nonuniversity agencies for research are, in general, not the most effective way of ensuring a good combination of research and advanced training. Thus, reform is likely to be in the context of established universities.

It is unlikely that there will be a repetition of the large scale institutional changes attempted in the 1960s in the near future.. These reforms were seen as too disruptive and, in many instances, too expensive. There is little enthusiasm for massive organizational restructuring. Thus, reforms will probably be more modest in nature and will be more incremental in nature. In the industrialized nations, the dramatic expansion of the 1960s has come to an end and academic institutions and systems have focused more on "fine tuning" existing structures than major new initiatives. Indeed, the worldwide movement of academic systems to move from elite to mass to universal access, as identified by Martin Trow, has in the industrialized nations virtually come to an end.[43] Most of the Western European academic systems have stopped at the threshold of "mass" systems and have not moved toward providing access to postsecondary education to virtually anyone wishing it. Only the United States, Canada and to lesser extent Japan provide extraordinarily wide access. In the Third World, expansion has not stopped as nations seek to provide the opportunities demanded by growing middle classes and also provide the skilled personnel required by increasingly sophisticated economies. For the most part, Third World nations have been occupied with the tasks of building up their university systems and have not significantly reformed them. It is possible that there may be a need for significant adjustment in the coming years.

In a broad comparative framework and with historical perspective, the amount of university reform that has taken place in the post World War Two period is impressive. Much of the expansion of this period was basically unplanned--the result of accommodating to the demands of the economy and of the population. Yet, adjusting universities to this expansion was a formidable task. Added to this challenge was the rapid growth of the "mission" of the university; applied research, links with industry, selecting for newer occupations, providing social mobility and others. Academic systems, with considerable difficulty, did in the end adjust to these challenges. In Europe and North America, the unrest of the 1960s highlighted the crisis and stimulated responses.

Change in higher education is usually a slow and incremental process. Reform is often not perceived in the glacial process of change. Yet, when universities, governments and other agencies are involved in the planning of change, and then in implementing these plans, reform is involved. Thus, reform will continue in the coming period, since universities continue to be challenged by new demands. It is likely that for the immediate future reform will be more modest, but nonetheless it will be an integral part of the academic system.

Endnotes

1. Murray G. Ross, The University: Anatomy of Academe (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976).
2. A. B. Cobban, The Medieval Universities (London: Metheun, 1975).
3. Philip G. Altbach, University Reform: An International Perspective (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980).
4. T. R. McConnell, "Autonomy and Accountability: Some Fundamental Issues," in Higher Education in American Society, eds., Philip G. Altbach and Robert O. Berdahl (Buffalo, N. Y.: Prometheus, 1987), pp. 39-58.
5. Edward Shils, "Change and Reform," in University Reform: Comparative Perspectives for the Seventies, ed. Philip G. Altbach (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1974), pp. 15-27.
6. Arthur Levine, Why Innovation Fails: The Institutionalization and Termination of Innovation in Higher Education (Albany, N. Y.: SUNY Press, 1980).
7. Philip G. Altbach, University Reform: An International Perspective, pp. 3-5.
8. Edward Shils, "Change and Reform". See also Edward Shils, The Academic Ethic (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
9. See Charles E. McClelland, State, Society and University in Germany, 1700-1914 (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
10. Peter Blau, The Organization of Academic Work (New York: Wiley, 1973).
11. Burton Clark, The Higher Education System (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).
12. See Howard Bowen and Jack Schuster, American Professors (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
13. R. Steven Turner, "University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany, 1760-1806," in The University in Society, Vol. II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974). pp. 495-532.
14. Peter Sheldrake and Russell Linke, eds., Accountability in Higher Education (Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin, 1979).
15. Martin Trow, "The Expansion and Transformation of Higher Education", International Review of Education 18 (1972), pp. 61-81.
16. Joseph Ben-David, Fundamental Research and the Universities (Paris: OECD, 1968).
17. Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

18. Wolfgang Nitsch, et al., Hochschule in der Demokratie (Berlin: Luchterhand, 1965).
19. Alexander Astin, et al., The Power of Protest (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).
20. Arthur Levine, in his Why Innovation Fails uses this term.
21. Laurence Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).
22. See Philip G. Altbach, ed., The Relevance of American Higher Education to Southeast Asia (Singapore: Regional Institute for Higher Education and Development, 1985).
23. Hugh Hawkins, Between Harvard and America: The Educational Leadership of Charles W. Eliot (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).
24. See Philip G. Altbach and V. Selvaratnam, eds., From Dependence to Autonomy: The Development of Asian Universities (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer, 1989).
25. For example, see David Daiches, ed., The Idea of a New University: An Experiment at Sussex (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1964).
26. "University Reform in Germany," Minerva 8 (April, 1970), pp. 242-64. For a different perspective, see Marlin Krueger and Barebel Wallisch-Prinz, "The Current Debate in West Germany," in University Reform: Comparative Perspectives for the Seventies, pp. 175-187.
27. K. Kitamura and W. K. Cummings, "The 'Big Bang' Theory and Japanese University Reform," in University Reform: Comparative Perspectives for the Seventies, pp. 138-159.
28. Gunnar Bergendal, "U68: A Reform Proposal for Swedish Higher Education," Higher Education 3 (August 1974), pp. 353-364.
29. For a philosophical discussion of the reforms, see Allan Bloom, The Closing of the American Mind (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).
30. See Wolfgang Nitsch, et al, Hochschule in der Demokratie.
31. Arthur Levine, When Dreams and Heroes Die: A Portrtait of Today's College Student (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980).
32. "Special Issue: The Legacy of Robbins," Oxford Review of Education 14 (No. 1, 1988), 3-96.
33. Allan Bloom, in some ways, has put forth a thoroughgoing critique of American higher education that has received widespread attention. See his The Closing of the American Mind.
34. See Philip G. Altbach, ed., University Reform: Comparative Perspectives for the Seventies.

35. See Chrisopher Driver, The Exploding University (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972).
36. Manuel Crespo, "The Management of Austerity in Higher Education: An International Comparison," Higher Education 18 (1989), pp. 373-395. See also Ladislav Cerych and Paul Sabatier, Great Expectations and Mixed Performance: The Implementation of Higher Education Reforms in Europe (Trentham, England: Trentham Books, 1986).
37. Hans Draheim, "The Gesamthochschule: A Model of Mobility," Prospects 3 (Winter 1973), pp 504-514.
38. Walter Perry, The Open University (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977).
39. Daniel Levy, Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges to Public Dominance (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).
40. Habiba Cohen, Elusive Reform: The French Universities, 1968-1978 (Boulder, Co,: Westview, l978)
41. Marlis Krueger and Baerbel Wallisch-Prinz, "The Current Debate in West Germany."
42. "Universities and Industry," European Journal of Education 20 (No.1, 1985), pp.5-66.
43. Martin Trow, "The Expansion and Transformation of Higher Education."

SPECIAL STUDIES

published by the Comparative Education Center
State University of New York at Buffalo

Please Note: All items are available for sale, except those that are out of print.

1. Philip G. Altbach and Gail P. Kelly, Comparative Education: A Preliminary Bibliography (April, 1981), OUT OF PRINT.
2. Chuka Onkonkwo, Language in African Education: A Comparative Analysis of Curricular Elements of School Texts (May, 1978). OUT OF PRINT.
3. Lois Weis, Schooling, Attitudes and Modernization: The Case of Ghana (Spring, 1979). OUT OF PRINT.
4. Burton Clark, Internationalizing Higher Education: Report of Conference (April, 1979). OUT OF PRINT.
5. Philip G. Altbach, The Academic Profession: Perspectives on an International Crisis (With Bibliography), (November, 1979). OUT OF PRINT.
6. Gail P. Kelly, The Professionalization of Teachers and the Distribution of Classroom Knowledge: Perspective from Colonial Vietnam (September, 1980).
7. John Bodnar; Vandra Masemann; and Ray C. Rist, Multicultural Education: Perspectives for the 1980's (November, 1980). OUT OF PRINT.
8. Michael W. Apple and Philip Wexler, New Directions in Education: Critical Perspectives (1981). OUT OF PRINT.
9. Karen Biraimah, Unequal Knowledge Distribution: The Schooling Experience in a Togolese Secondary School (1981). ISBN No. 0-937033-00-6.
10. Lois Weis, ed., Issues in Education: Schooling and the Reproduction of Class and Gender Inequalities (1982). OUT OF PRINT.
11. Gail P. Kelly, 'When I Became a Fonctionnaire': School Knowledge in French Colonial Africa (1984). ISBN No. 0-937033-01-4.
12. Kowsar P. Chowdhury, Efforts in Universalization of Primary Education: The Case of Bangladesh (1984). ISBN No. 0-937033-02-2.
13. Excellence, Reform and Equity in Education: An International Perspective (Essays by Rosemary Deem, Michael W. Apple, Miriam E. David, and Henry Giroux) (1985). ISBN No. 0-937033-03-0.
14. Delbert Long, Educational Reform in the Soviet Union. (1985). ISBN No. 0-937033-04-9.
15. David H. Kelly, Bilingual/Multicultural Education in Canada: Interpretation and Bibliography. (1986). ISBN No. 0-937033-06-5.

16. Y. G-M. Lulat; Philip G. Altbach; and David H. Kelly, *Governmental and Institutional Policies on Foreign Students: An Overview and Bibliography*. (1986). ISBN No. 0937033-05-7.

17. Lois Weis, ed. *Race, Class and Schooling*. (1986). ISBN No. 0-937033-07-03. OUT OF PRINT.

18. Dennis Mbuyi, *Beyond Policy and Language Choice: An Analysis of Texts in Four Instructional Contents in East Africa*, (1987). ISBN 0-937033-08-01.

19. Wu Wei, et al., *Educational Development and Reform in the Peoples Republic of China*. (1987).

20. Thomas Owen Eisemon, *Benefiting from Basic Education in Developing Countries: A Review of Research on the External Efficiency of Educational Investments* (1987).

21. Jing Wang and Yenbo Wu, eds., *Perspectives on Contemporary Education in China* (1989) ISBN 0-937033-11-1.

The studies are available for $6.00 each, POSTPAID. Checks must be made out to 'COMPARATIVE EDUCATION CENTER,' and sent to the PUBLICATIONS DIVISION, COMPARATIVE EDUCATION CENTER, 428 BALDY HALL, S.U.N.Y. AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260, U.S.A.. STANDING ORDERS ARE WELCOME.